This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

THE
LANDRETH FAMILY
BOOK FUND

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

Samuel Smith

MY LIFE-WORK

BY

SAMUEL SMITH M.P.

WITH PORTRAIT AND ILLUSTRATIONS

Butler & Tanner The Selwood Printing Works Frome and London

of interest. It was filled full of strenuous effort, and varied by much travel, but the very variety may make it easier for the reader. Some subjects may seem to claim a disproportionate space, especially that of our great Indian Empire; but it laid hold of me forty years ago, and has engaged much of my time and labours ever since. I have long felt that it involves by far the most difficult problems that confront our nation in the future, exceeding in complexity even those of South Africa, and I have offered the best suggestions I can give after pondering those questions for a lifetime. I have also dealt at some length with American questions, which I have studied closely in several visits, for our future relations with America are almost as important as those with India.

Those not interested in special subjects, such, for instance, as the bimetallic controversy, can pass them over; but an effort has been made to free such questions from technicality, and make them intelligible to the general reader.

A certain amount of repetition is unavoidable, for public men have often to recur to the same subjects, and extracts from speeches and addresses are of necessity numerous. But many of these are thrown into the Appendix, so as not to break the course of the narrative unduly.

This work has been pursued under difficulties: often intermitted in times of weakness, then resumed, and frequently pencilled in bed. It seemed at times a race with health, and even with life. The indulgence of the reader is claimed on this account; but if my book should inspire generous and ardent youth to a nobler life, it will have attained its object. May it enable some who come after me to leave—

"Footprints on the sands of time—
Footprints, which perhaps another,
Sailing o'er life's solemn main,
Some forlorn and shipwrecked brother,
Seeing, may take heart again."

SAMUEL SMITH.

Orchill, Braco, Perthshire,
August, 1902.

PAGE

CHAPTER VIII

The Franco-Prussian War—Religious and Philanthropic Work in Liverpool—The Town Council and Chamber of Commerce—Moody and Sankey 87

CHAPTER IX

"Conditional Immortality"—The Credibility of the Christian Religion 95

CHAPTER X

We come to "Carleton"—Work at the Coliseum—The Temperance Movement in Liverpool 105

CHAPTER XI

Death of my Father and Sister—The Chamber of Commerce and the Silver Question 111

CHAPTER XII

The City of Glasgow Bank Failure—The Bulgarian Atrocities—Agricultural Distress—Peasant Proprietary on the Continent—The Waldenses—Missionary Enterprises 119

CHAPTER XIII

Liverpool Temperance Work—Political Situation in Liverpool—"Craigieburn" 126

CHAPTER XIV

Mr. Gladstone and the Irish Question—I am adopted as Liberal Candidate for Liverpool—The Election Campaign—I become Liberal Member for Liverpool—Social Reform—"Saving the Children" 132

CHAPTER XV

My First Session—Life in Parliament—The Bradlaugh Question—"Overstrain in Education"—Socialism in England—Effect of Parliamentary Life 141

CHAPTER XVI

Henry George and the Nationalization of the Land 148

CHAPTER XXVII

Session of 1888—The Indian Famine—The Liquor Laws in India—Demoralizing Literature — Henry Drummond at Grosvenor House—Pan-Presbyterian Alliance Meetings—I acquire Orchill, Perthshire, for an Autumn Residence—The Ashbourne Act . . 1

CHAPTER XXVIII

Session of 1889—Debate on Evening Continuation Schools—Payment of Members—Drink and Opium in India—Death of John Bright —The Bimetallic Movement—Welsh Intermediate Education Act—The Armenians 1

CHAPTER XXIX

Orchill—Visit to Ireland—The Home Rule Question and Federal Government for the Empire 2

CHAPTER XXX

Session of 1890—Bimetallism again—"The Publicans' Compensation Bill"—The Madagascar Question 1

CHAPTER XXXI

Trip to the West Highlands—The Baring Crisis—The Fall of Mr. Parnell—General Booth's "Darkest England" Scheme . . 1

CHAPTER XXXII

Session of 1891—Death of W. H. Smith—Irish Land Purchase Bill—Opium Trade Resolution—I Visit the Cambridge Union—Death of Parnell—Licensing Reform in Liverpool 1

CHAPTER XXXIII

Trip to Italy—Visit to Mount Vesuvius—Amalfi—Session of 1892—India — Welsh Disestablishment — Women's Suffrage — The Kanaka Labour Traffic—General Election—Returned for Flintshire for the Third Time—Illness and Death of Mrs. Smith—Session of 1893—Second Home Rule Bill 1

CHAPTER XXXIV

Session of 1893—The "May Meetings" at Exeter Hall—A Hot Season—The "Free Fight" in the House of Commons—The Home Rule Bill—Death of W. P. Lockhart—Retirement of Mr. Gladstone 3

CHAPTER XLIV

Session of 1899—Lawlessness in the Church of England—Death of Mr. Thomas Ellis—The Church Discipline Bill — The South African War—Fourth Visit to America . . . . . .

CHAPTER XLV

Session of 1900—The Church Question—The Indian Famine—Reflections on India—Plays and their Supervision—Clericalism in Voluntary Schools — Condition of the Streets of London — National Defence—National Religion—Conclusion . . .

Appendix I . . . . . .
Appendix II . . . . . .
Appendix III . . . . . .
Appendix IV . . . . . .
Appendix V . . . . . .
Appendix VI . . . . . .
Appendix VII . . . . . .
Appendix VIII . . . . . .
Appendix IX . . . . . .
Appendix X . . . . . .
Appendix XI . . . . . .
Appendix XII . . . . . .
Appendix XIII . . . . . .
Appendix XIV . . . . . .
Appendix XV . . . . . .
Appendix XVI . . . . . .
Appendix XVII . . . . . .
Appendix XVIII . . . . . .
Index . . . . . .

BORGUE PARISH CHURCH

ROBERTON, BORGUE

CHAPTER I

Early Life at Borgue—The "Disruption"—Religious Teaching in Scotland—My Favourite Reading—Edinburgh University—Excursions to the Highlands—Education in Scottish Universities

DURING a period of poor health, when laid aside from active work, I have been induced by my dear old friend Dr. Murray Mitchell to set down some reminiscences of my past life. I do not propose an autobiography so much as a thread of recollections of the various activities and public questions with which I have been concerned for more than forty years. Some reflections on these topics made from "the loopholes of retreat," and away from the fret and worry of public life, may be of interest and profit to some travellers on life's journey. A softer light falls on the controversies of life, and a gentler view is taken of human weakness and imperfections as the sun sinks towards the western horizon. The true proportions of things are seen more clearly as personal hopes and ambitions disappear, and one gains truer glimpses of that perfect judgment which the All-wise Disposer of events will one day pass on human deeds and motives. It is in this spirit that the writer wishes to journey along the path of his past life, going swiftly over the earlier portion, and dwelling more on what is of public interest.

I was born on January 11, 1836, at Roberton, in the parish of Borgue, Kirkcudbrightshire. My father occupied the farm of Roberton, and also farmed his own property of South Carleton, and considerable land besides; and my early reminiscences are those of a vigorous active agricultural life on a large scale, in a community made up of farmers, labourers, and a few landlords. Those were days of low prices for beef and mutton, high prices for bread, and low wages for labourers (about half what they are now), and hard times prevailed all over the country. Economy and hard work were the rule among all but the richest class, and our home-life taught the invaluable lessons of thrift and industry combined with reading and culture beyond the average of the time.

My grandfather, the Rev. Samuel Smith, was the parish minister of Borgue from 1796 to 1816. He removed there from Carsphairn, where he was parish minister before. He was much esteemed as a faithful minister, and was also known as an authority on rural economy, having written a standard work on the agriculture of Galloway. He died just after opening the new parish church in 1816. (See Appendix I for an interesting account of him by Rev. James Henderson in his memorials of the parish.) After an interval of eighteen years my uncle and namesake succeeded him as parish minister; and soon afterwards, in 1843, occurred that great event, the "Disruption" of the Church of Scotland, when a large portion of the most godly and learned of the clergy, followed by many of the laity, gave up their churches and livings for conscience' sake.

The present generation can scarcely realize how deeply Scotland was moved by that great event. It was an object-lesson of self-sacrifice such as had not been witnessed since the days of the Covenanters, or since the ejectment of the Puritan clergy from the Anglican Church in 1662. The main point at issue was the claim to spiritual independence on the part of the Church as recognized by the Revolution Settlement of 1688, and the Act of Union between England and Scotland. The burning question was the exercise of the right of patronage in the presentation of ministers to charges. During the previous century the right of the congregation to refuse ministers they objected to had been gradually filched from them by decisions of the Civil Courts, and various secessions had occurred out of which sprang the United Presbyterian Church. At last a powerful movement sprang up within the Church of Scotland itself, to restore the original rights of the congregations. It synchronized with a marked revival of religious life, led and fashioned by such men as Chalmers, Candlish, Cunningham and Guthrie. The conflict between the civil and spiritual courts became so acute at last that it was obvious one or other must give way. And when a final decision was given by the Supreme Court against the claim of the Church to veto objectionable presentees, styled "the Veto Act," the decision was taken by a large section of the Presbyterian clergy to give up the status and emoluments of an Established Church, and to found a "Free Church," maintained by voluntary effort and governed by its own spiritual courts according to what they conceived to be the teaching of the New Testament.

purchased by the sacrifices made by the "Free Church" in 1843. It may be added that the old theory once universally held in the Church of Scotland that the State owed protection and support to an orthodox form of religion, gradually waned after the Disruption. The logic of events slowly displaced the "Establishment principle" from the mind of the Free Church, and prepared the way for the consummation of the union with the United Presbyterian Church in 1900, though the latter was founded on the "voluntary principle," which denied altogether the justice of State establishments of religion. No doubt the evolution of history is designed to educate mankind even in the sphere of religion. The Providence of God has deeply modified the old Presbyterian theory of the relation of Church and State, and indirectly its effect is traceable in England, where a similar change is gradually passing over the mind of the Anglican Church—at least, the High Church section of it.

I cannot part with this subject without recalling the devoted labours of my three maiden aunts, the Misses Smith, of Katrine Bank, in the cause of the Free Church. The grounds of their pretty place extended to the Free Church on one side and the Established Church on the other; and after the Disruption their home and Irish car were at the disposal of the seceding ministers who went over Galloway stirring up their faithful followers. The two older of my aunts in particular were ladies of deep religious spirit, and exerted a great influence for good over our family of seven children, of which I was the eldest; and I may add that my father's upright walk and conversation (I never knew a more truthful man), and my mother's great kindness and hospitality were of inestimable value in forming our characters. I look back on a happy home life in a pleasantly situated house near the seashore, and the delight of our childhood days was to build "castles" and make "docks" to receive the flowing tide. At spring tides we were always on the shore to witness the inrush of the sea, and I can hardly describe the strange sensation of joy mixed with melancholy which the ebb and flow of the tide occasioned me. Those lines of Byron were true of my boyish experience:—

> And I have loved thee, ocean! and my joy
> Of youthful sports was on thy breast to be
> Borne, like the bubbles, onward: from a boy
> I wantoned with the breakers—they to me
> Were a delight; and if the freshening sea

scoriae and dust of the pavement. The din of the market-place and the last edition of the newspaper shut out the lovely face of Nature. A generation is growing up sharpened to a needle's point in all that relates to the forum, the exchange, and the race-course, but oblivious of "the music of the spheres."

My earliest education was under a pious nursery-governess, whose simple faith made a deep impression on our youthful minds. Parents cannot be too careful in choosing the nurse and the nursery-governess for their children. They often give a direction to character which continues through life for good or evil. At the age of eight I went to Borgue Academy, which was just a superior parish school with a small endowment. In those days the parish schools of Scotland usually taught Latin, Greek, and Mathematics, and prepared for the Universities, in addition to giving ordinary elementary education to the children of labourers. All classes sent their children to the parish school. Scotland owes much of its prosperity to the admirable system of education established by John Knox at the time of the Reformation. In all the Schools the Bible and Shorter Catechism were taught; and we committed to memory large numbers of psalms and paraphrases, which were of inestimable value in after life. I cannot speak so highly of the spiritual good derived from learning the Shorter Catechism. It is a most able summary of Calvinistic doctrine; but it is difficult for a child to understand, and it is built so entirely on the doctrine of predestination that it leaves on the mind a dreary sense of human helplessness. At least it did so with me. I fancy it does so with many children of imaginative temperament. No doubt many of the definitions are admirable. Probably no compendium of doctrine was ever more logically framed, but its very logic throws into the shade some of the most vital truths of Revelation, above all, that central truth—the sun of the Christian system—"God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." As children we could not reason about such things; but I can well remember the dreary and hopeless feeling caused by the statement that our destiny was fixed by the inscrutable decrees of God before the foundation of the world, and that nothing we could do would alter the Divine purposes.

In the times to which I refer the opinion widely prevailed in Scotland that the Bible could be interpreted like a book of mathematics: that it could be all divided into watertight compartments,

My school life was hardly a happy one. The roughness of the boys in those days was excessive. Their chief amusement was fighting. We had incessant stone fights on our way home, and I once almost lost an eye. The discipline of the school was stern; flogging was a matter of daily, almost hourly occurrence. Our head-master was an able man and a good scholar, but too severe, and we often trembled as we entered the school and saw the frown on his face. He recalled Goldsmith's description:—

> A man severe he was and stern to view:
> I knew him well, and every truant knew.
> Well had the boding tremblers learned to trace
> The day's disasters in his morning face.
> Full sweetly laughed with counterfeited glee
> At all his jokes, for many a joke had he.
> Full well the busy whisper circling round,
> Conveyed the dismal tidings when he frowned:
> Yet he was kind, or if severe in aught
> The love he bare to learning was in fault.
>
> (*The Deserted Village.*)

We had no school-boards in those days, and the schoolmaster was practically omnipotent in his own domain. Far more considerate ways of dealing with children are now in the ascendant, and school is often made a happy place to the young. My real educators were the English classics in my father's library. He inherited a good collection of the best literature from my grandfather, the minister of the parish, and I spent most of my spare time in the library, devouring all that I found there. My childish favourites were *Robinson Crusoe* and the *Pilgrim's Progress*. The latter I had almost by heart, and the impression it made was ineffaceable. It was in almost every Scotch home in those days, and we cannot estimate what the nation owes to it. A great part of the piety of last century drew its inspiration from Bunyan. He is far too little read now. Modern novels were hardly known in those days, excepting Sir Walter Scott's, whose romances were really a pictorial history of Scotland. I read all the historical books I could get, and if I remember rightly had read Plutarch's *Lives* more than once before I was twelve, and Rollin's *Ancient History* in twelve volumes; and soon after that I read all Gibbons' *Decline and Fall* and all Shakespeare's plays, besides most of the standard poetry of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, such as Milton, Pope, and Dryden, Thompson, Goldsmith, Gray, etc., and nearly all Addison's *Spectator*. I

Any fitness I have had for Parliamentary life I ascribe largely to my historical reading.

My school life in Borgue came to an end about fourteen or fifteen, and I then had a short time at the academy in Kirkcudbright, and entered Edinburgh University before I was sixteen, going into the Senior Humanity class in the days of Pillans, and the Junior Greek the year before that eccentric genius John Stuart Blackie came to us. I was also under Kelland in Mathematics—an excellent teacher. I spent two winter sessions and one summer session in Edinburgh, throwing my whole soul into classical learning; and read under Blackie, in my second session, the three great plays of Aeschylus, the *Prometheus Bound*, the *Persians*, and the *Furies*. Their grandeur made a deep impression on me. Blackie was a poet and genius, but a poor teacher. My summer session was delightful, as I took Botany under Professor Balfour, and made charming excursions to gather plants all round Edinburgh and the English lake district. There stands out in my memory as one of the happiest times of my life an excursion of forty students to Windermere. We botanized over Helvellyn to Patterdale, and afterwards walked to Penrith, and the beauty of the scenery almost intoxicated me. We came back to Edinburgh footsore and tired with incessant walking.

I should have mentioned that my frequent trips with my father to the hills and dales of Galloway were a wonderful delight. I climbed with him Cairnsmore and Criffel by the time I was eight or ten years old; and we made annual fishing expeditions to Loch Grannoch for several years, living in the little lodge, with a babbling brook running past, and delicious odours of heather and rhododendrons perfuming the air. We carried our food for a week or ten days on our backs, with the aid of a serving man, walking six miles over the soft moor (too soft for ponies), and we lived there far away from the world in romantic seclusion. A little later, when I was fourteen, I travelled with my father for six weeks in the Highlands; we did much of it on foot, climbing then or on a later tour, Ben Nevis, Ben MacDhui, Lochnagar, Ben Lawers, and that almost inaccessible mountain, Scuir Nan Gillian, in Skye. Two adventures stand out in my memory. We started to walk from Portree to Quiraing, taking the Storr Hill on our way. We tarried too long admiring the splendid view, and the night fell on us, and we lost our way on the moors. We were followed by a kindly Highlander, who saw that we were belated travellers, and he took

us near midnight to a little village of thatched cottages pitched in a glen beside a brawling stream. He gave us quarters in one of the largest of the cottages, and next morning when we awoke we found the family of three generations swarming about us. They had all slept in one large room, curtained off into apartments. We got true Highland hospitality, with a courtesy that might have become an ancient chieftain, and all recompense was declined. But for this kindly intervention we might have slept in a peat-stack on the moors. Next day we had a long walk to the curious precipitous hill called Quiraing, and we made our way back by a little fishing smack to Portree, and entered the bay with a large fleet of fishing boats on a lovely summer evening.

The other adventure was the attempt to reach the summit of Scuir Nan Gillian, the highest of the Coolins. We started at 5 a.m. from Sligaghan Hotel, and clambered up an almost perpendicular face by putting our feet into the crevices of the rock. We reached a narrow ledge where we had to lie flat, as there was a precipice on either side, and above us rose the smooth dome which crowned the mountain. We found it impossible to get further; but I understand that steps have been cut, or a ladder placed against it, by which the ascent can now be made. At the time I refer to, half a century ago, the ascent had only been made once, as far as I remember. It was then the Matterhorn of Scotland. I knew the mountaineer who afterwards lost his life there. We got back to our hotel on a broiling hot day and breakfasted at 11, and then walked to Broadford, which we did not reach till dark, thoroughly tired out.

These long excursions with my father were of great advantage to me. He was a man of rare sagacity and sound judgment, and we discussed all manner of subjects. My father had also a fine perception of the beauties of nature, especially of mountain scenery, and trained me to observe every effect of sea or sky, of mountain or flood. My pulse beat to these lines of Scott :—

> O, Caledonia, stern and wild!
> Meet nurse for a poetic child.
> Land of brown heath and shaggy wood,
> Land of the mountain and the flood:
> Land of my sires! What mortal hand
> Can e'er untie the filial band,
> That knits me to thy rugged strand?

Before passing from my college life, let me say that I intensely

enjoyed my studies and longed to continue them at least up t
the completion of the Arts course. The scholarship of Scotc
undergraduates in those days was not high. There were no en
trance examinations, and youths of fifteen or sixteen came up fro
the country knowing but little Latin and less Greek, and anxious t
get through the long period of eight years' study required for th
clerical and medical professions. They lived in lodgings withou
any supervision—not a good system—and many were very poo
I knew of some who almost lived on oatmeal porridge, and regu
larly got their bag of meal sent from home. They often eked ou
their income by private teaching, and led laborious lives. Th
usual custom was to study late at night; and most of us got int
the habit of sitting up to one or two in the morning. Befor
examination times we crammed with great severity, though th
professional "crammer" was not then known. I remember o
one occasion rising at 2 a.m. on Monday (for on Sunday I neve
touched my college books), and working the whole day and a
next night without going to bed, and I just finished two essays i
time to deposit them at midnight on Tuesday. When intolerabl
drowsiness overpowered me, I dashed water on my face, and dran
strong tea as long as the landlady sat up. Many of us injured ou
health by these insane practices, but none of our professors eve
gave us a word of counsel or guidance on such subjects. Colleg
life in Scotland was a rough and ready means of developing energ
and perseverance, but not fine scholarship. An Arts course gav
a tolerable acquaintance with the main lines of human knov
ledge to those who studied conscientiously; but it was needf
to finish in England or Germany to get really high scholarship, a
graduates leaving Edinburgh and Glasgow at twenty, oftentim
put in two or three years more at Oxford or Cambridge.

I would add, however, that the all-round training of the mi
and above all, the self-reliance and perseverance evoked, wa
better preparation for the common work of life than the min
and verbal scholarship of the English or German universiti
Those Scottish youths, brought up on porridge, Shorter Catechis
and hard work, went to the front in India, in America, and *t*
Colonies, and rose to the highest commercial positions in Englan
No doubt great improvements have been made since then. Schola
ship is much higher now. Mr. Carnegie's noble gift will largel
benefit the technical side of Scottish education. Immense stride
have been made in science of all kinds, especially in medicine

CHAPTER II

Early Business Life in Liverpool—The Philomathic Society—The Cotton Trade—Commercial Panic of 1857—Holiday in Wales

I HAD now to face the question of my future career. I had a strong taste for literature, but felt no call to one of the learned professions. It was needful for me as the eldest of seven children, with "res angusta domi," to make my way in life pretty early. I had no taste for agriculture, and there seemed no opening except in commercial life. About it I knew nothing and cared nothing. Yet I finally decided, with my father's sanction, to seek an opening in a business house in Liverpool; and towards the end of 1853 we came together to Liverpool, and it ended in my being apprenticed to a firm of cotton-brokers. It was in one sense a great trial. All my tastes and youthful ambitions were quenched for a time, and I found the dull routine of the counting-house wearisome beyond measure. The change from the literature and philosophy of Greece and Rome to the making of invoices and account sales seemed a kind of degradation; but I resolved to do my best to master the business scientifically, and turned my attention to political economy and commercial statistics, and used up all my spare time in study. I set aside four hours an evening in my lodgings, dividing them between the classics, history, philosophy, and political economy. About that time, or soon after, I carefully studied Locke on *The Human Understanding*, and some of the works of Reid and Dugald Stewart, and also thoroughly mastered Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*, the best foundation for economic science. From it I proceeded to John Stuart Mill, and a little later took up specially the question of monetary science, studying such writers as Ricardo, Fullarton and Bagehot. This most difficult branch of political economy had a special fascination for me. For many years I read largely in this direction, and it prepared me for the

plished minister, who afterwards settled in Glasgow, and was succeeded by the Rev. James Muir, D.D., who long ministered to the Church at Egremont.

But my best training in the art of speaking was at the Liverpool Philomathic Society, which I joined in 1857 (I think). It then met at the Royal Institution, Colquit Street. To my youthful imagination the orators of those days seemed budding Ciceros. James Spence was then at the height of his fame—one of the most eloquent speakers I ever listened to—afterwards well known as the writer to the *Times* under the signature of S., in favour of the Southern Confederacy during the American Civil War. Charles Clarke was a prodigy of information on all subjects, with a great flow of eloquence. His early death was a great disappointment to many of us who anticipated a brilliant career for him. I well remember the portly Woodburn, with whom I had a great debate on the question: "Was the civilization of Ancient Greece superior to that of Ancient Rome?" Of course I took the Grecian side. The caustic, yet kindly James Birch, the humorous W. B. Marshall, the indefatigable secretary, John MacLaughlin, and the venerable treasurer, R. A. Payne, were regular attendants. At a later date Sir James Picton (with whom I debated the bimetallic question), the two Forwoods, Sir Arthur and Sir William, Richard Steele, and other well-known public men in Liverpool joined the Society, which is still flourishing. I never can forget the enjoyment of these *noctes Ambrosianae*, which to us lonely lodgers were "a feast of reason and a flow of soul." I served as President of the Society in the sixties, but ceased to be a regular attendant after my marriage in 1864.

Through a change in the constitution of the firm in which I was employed, I obtained the management of the cotton saleroom in 1857, and so had to go "on 'change"; and much of my time was spent "on the flags," as the open area was styled where the cotton-brokers assembled "sub Jove frigido" to transact their business. In all weathers, cold and wet, winter and summer, we stood outside, sometimes sheltering under the arches when the rain and cold were unendurable. It was a discipline which killed off weakly men and made the healthy still hardier. As our business involved much foreign intercourse, and was greatly affected by the course of foreign affairs, especially by wars and the fear of wars, we became as a matter of course keen politicians, and the news of the day was debated at great length. On the whole it was a

Next year I made my Easter excursion to Dolgelley, and started from that place at 5 a.m. to climb Cader Idris. I made my way to the top alone, and found the hollows still filled with winter snow. On descending I tried to slide down one of these snow slopes, and, losing my balance, shot down a steep descent a good way before I could pull myself up. I got back to the hotel to breakfast at eleven, and then walked to Tan-y-Bwlch, after making a long divergence to visit some waterfalls. It was 10 p.m. when I reached my hotel footsore and lame.

Yet these were days of intense enjoyment. They relieved the dreary monotony of Liverpool life, and they paved the way for countless Welsh tours in later life, when I had the joy of escorting many parties of friends through the delicious scenery of which Snowdon is the centre. Many times we made the ascent of that monarch of Welsh mountains; and to this day no hill in the Three Kingdoms has for me such a charm. Alas! as I think of these early excursions, the shades of the departed rise before my mind, for few of my youthful companions are now left. Llandudno was a favourite resort for the week-end. I used to worship in the bright Congregational Chapel, where I met my old friend Charlton Hall—that stout Nonconformist and Liberal, whose kindness I shall never forget. The acquaintance then formed ripened into a friendship which endured till he was taken away not long ago at the age of 91, retaining all his powers almost to the end. I never can forget the delightful walks round the Great Orme's Head, and the early morning walk of four miles to Conway Station on Monday morning to catch the train for Liverpool at 7 a.m. Since those days the entire coast line of North Wales has become fringed with villas and lodging-houses, which give life and health to the city populations of Lancashire and the Midlands.

CHAPTER III

First Visit to America—The Civil War—My Journeyings through the States and Canada — Political and Municipal Life in America—Return to Liverpool

It was my ambition to pay a visit to the Southern States of America before commencing business in Liverpool on my own account, and I decided to sever my connection with the firm that employed me at the end of 1859, and to start off for a lengthened tour in America at the beginning of 1860. I sailed in an old screw steamer early in January, which took eighteen days to go to New York. We had very bad weather most of the time, bitterly cold, dark, and gloomy, and sometimes the deck was covered with ice. There were only forty passengers, and most of us were very sick, and till the last week of the voyage hardly came to know one another. My recollection of that voyage is one of intense dreariness, but on approaching America the bright blue sky and cheerful sunshine raised our spirits, as the floating driftweed did to Columbus when he approached the Western world (to compare small things with great)! and I well remember the exhilaration caused by the dazzling atmosphere when we reached New York.

My first plunge into the eager commercial life of the Western Metropolis was a kind of revelation—the splendour of the streets, and warehouses, the enormous traffic, the extraordinary energy of the people, amazed me. The hotels seemed palatial, though now they are quite eclipsed by far more luxurious creations. In those days the Astor House and Fifth Avenue were the leading hotels; but these pale beside the Waldorf and Manhattan houses to-day. Hard frost and an intensely clear sky then prevailed in the Northern States, a wonderful contrast to the grimy atmosphere of Liverpool. The effect was almost intoxicating. I then began to realize, as I did on several successive visits, that the sanguine temperament of the Americans is largely due to their climate, which operates like a

garrison, and for years Charleston was blockaded and bombarded. Much of the city was burned, and much destroyed by an earthquake. Most of its high-spirited youth perished in battle, or died of disease and hardship, and when I last visited it, it seemed as if Ichabod were written upon it. Trade had taken other channels, and its glory had departed. I sailed through the circuitous channel of the "Sea Islands" to Savannah. On these islands the finest cotton in the world is grown, almost as delicate as silk. I recall the bright sunny day we coursed through these islands, like modern Argonauts, carrying off the Golden Fleece.

From Savannah I took a long railway journey to Montgomery on the Alabama river, touching at the pretty little cities of Augusta and Macon. An adventure with a wild Irishman who had served with the British Army in the Crimea may be recalled. He fastened upon me and retailed his intense hatred to England, and recited a story of outrages which I hesitate to put on paper. With great difficulty I got free from him; and this was the beginning of a study of the Irish question which enabled me many years after to understand and sympathize with Mr. Gladstone in his great attempt to make reparation to Ireland. The United States was at that time full of survivors of the awful Irish famine of 1847. They were poured into the Western World from the emigrant ships, often in a dying state. Their sufferings were imputed to the "brutal Saxon Government," but were due more truly to the wretched land system of Ireland, aggravated by the potato disease. But I found such hatred of our name and nation as opened my eyes to the real danger we incurred from the open sore of Ireland. It was long before public opinion in England awoke to the seriousness of the danger, but though it still exists, it is much less acute than in those days. The long course of healing legislation has removed many of the worst grievances of Ireland, and though the Celtic and Catholic population will not in our day forgive or forget the wrongs of the past, I could not but see in later visits to the United States that the fierce resentment of the fifties and sixties had considerably subsided. The Irish citizens had largely melted into the American Commonwealth, and most men of Irish descent now prefer to be called Americans. On my first visit I found the hotels and barbers' shops mostly served by Irishmen, and the rough work of the country, such as making canals and railways, done by their strong arms; but now the Irish have left these employments largely to Italians and other races of southern and

central Europe. It is wonderful to see now how little distinction there is between men of British, Irish, Teutonic and Scandinavian descent. The northern European races amalgamate in two generations, but the southern European races long remain apart. On my last visit to Chicago, I found entire quarters of the city occupied by Italians, Bohemians, Hungarians, etc., and found that in these districts hardly a man spoke English. It was then said that nine-tenths of the population of that huge city were of foreign birth; and no wonder Socialism and Anarchism flourish there, when we remember how many of these foreigners were expelled from their own countries for sedition or murderous conspiracies. The safeguard of America is the universal system of common schools where all are taught the English language, and trained by cultured American teachers, mostly women. One of the most delightful sights in America is the public school open to all and attended by all, where the future American citizen is educated for the duties and responsibilities of liberty, and trained for the most part on the moral, as well as the intellectual side. Though definite Scriptural teaching is scantier than one could wish, it may be said that Christianity is in the air, and the admirable training colleges of America turn out a highly-cultured and often truly religious type of teachers. These impart to the children of the foreign immigrant a wholesome conception of life and duty, and mould him usually into a good and patriotic citizen.

This little digression may be pardoned, though it antedates some of my experience. I sailed down the Alabama river to Mobile, paid a short visit to the "one horse cotton port," as Mobile used to be called, for the one business of the thriving little town was shipping cotton. Then I journeyed to the great emporium of the trade, New Orleans, which in those days presented an imposing spectacle. The levee or bank of the great Mississippi river, "the Father of waters" was lined with a double or triple row of cotton steamers extending for miles. The cotton bales were piled up on their decks till they looked like floating castles. The great river was then the highway of the vast trade of the south-west; some two millions of bales of cotton, besides great quantities of sugar, corn, tobacco, and other products reached New Orleans by river, for the railways had hardly begun to compete with water-carriage. The Southern feeling was intensely strong in this old semi-French city. The pride of its great trade and growing prosperity reminded one of the boastings of Tyre and Sidon as depicted by the Hebrew

prophets. The Southern papers were filled with scoffs at the unwarlike North, and threats as to what "the solid South" would do if any attempt was made to coerce it. The planting community was a fierce, reckless race. One of the first things I saw at the St. Charles' Hotel was the bullet marks of an affray between two of the guests, who fired on each other at table; and one was killed by the bowie-knife of his antagonist. Affrays in the street were almost of daily occurrence, and we kept close to lamp posts to get behind them in case pistol bullets flew about. On going up the Mississippi one constantly heard of plantations where the owner had been killed, and I may add that never in my life did I hear so much outrageous language and profane swearing as I did on those steamers.

I spent two months at New Orleans, studying the cotton business. The climate was delicious. March and April were like our finest summer weather. The huge cotton crop of 1859–1860 far exceeded all previous crops, reaching 4,800,000 bales (now eleven millions has been exceeded). It was little surmised that this was the last year of unbroken trade, and that before the next year closed, a strict blockade would stop all exit by the sea, and that for four years the cotton crops would remain pent up and rotting in the South, save for a small portion which filtered through the blockading squadrons, chiefly at Wilmington and Charleston. The blockade-running trade was mostly carried on from Liverpool and Glasgow, and reaped enormous profit when successful. If I remember aright the price was as low as 3*d*. or 4*d*. per lb. in the South, and reached in Liverpool during the height of the cotton famine 2*s*. 6*d*. per lb.! Yet, strange to say, nearly all the firms engaged in this contraband trade sooner or later lost their money!

I left New Orleans in the month of May and sailed up the Mississippi river, and afterwards up the Ohio as far as Louisville in a fine passenger steamer, taking six days for the voyage. I well remember the brightness and beauty of this voyage. We were mounted high up on a spar deck which overlooked the level country —most of it covered with forest and gay with the blossom of the magnolia. We met a continuous stream of great cotton steamers looking like floating castles, and the negro crews who did all the heavy work were usually singing or carolling with a gaiety which was apt to mislead a visitor. Those were the days when *Uncle Tom's Cabin* divided American sentiment as sharply as the first proclamation of the Gospel did in Judea. It was denounced by

fine, and there remains in my memory a vision of bright sunshine in the pleasant month of June which accompanied me in a rapid trip to Niagara, and down the St. Lawrence by Montreal to Quebec. I have paid several visits to Canada, but the first had a freshness and exhilaration beyond any other. The first sight of Niagara is an event in one's life. It is not altogether pure pleasure: I am more conscious of that feeling with smaller waterfalls. There is an oppression about the awful rush and irresistible force of the flood; one can quite understand why an impulse to leap over the edge often attacks excitable persons. I saw Blondin crossing below the suspension bridge on a single rope with a balancing pole in his hand. I understand that afterwards he carried across a man on his shoulders! "Quid non mortalia pectora cogis auri sacra fames?" What will men not do for lucre? I suppose more lives have been lost in foolhardy attempts to "shoot the rapids" than anywhere in the world. It was there that Captain Webb perished in trying to swim through the whirlpool, and my friend, Samuel James Capper, saved the life of a mad fellow who had advertised himself to go through the rapids lashed to the outside of a barrel. He prevailed on him to go inside the barrel, and so just saved his life, though his hearing was partially destroyed.

The sail down the St. Lawrence, through the "Thousand Isles," was a continuous delight. The crystal clearness of the vast river until the muddy Ottawa joins it is a delightful contrast to the turbid Mississippi. Alone of all rivers it continues to run winter and summer with unabated flow, draining half a continent and fed by the large inland seas which divide Canada from the United States. I was struck with the beauty of Montreal, and still more with that of Quebec, which I take to be the most picturesque city in the world. The joint monument to Wolfe and Montcalm, who fell together in the battle that ended French dominion in North America, deeply interested me, and so did the French population, which resemble a slice of old Catholic France. The petite culture, the industrious peasantry, the village churches with their glittering spires, and the general air of industry and contentment, impress one very favourably. The Anglo-Saxon race, as seen in the United States and in Western Canada, is far more enterprising and successful in amassing wealth, but one may well doubt whether they get more enjoyment out of life. It is on a small scale the difference between the British Empire—ever expanding, never allowing the "weary Titan" to rest—and the stationary realm of France,

where a thrifty peasantry is preoccupied in providing a *dot* for the daughter, and a morsel of land for the son of the family.

Before leaving the subject of America I may add that one of the deepest impressions made on me was of the widespread corruption both in political and municipal life. The press resounded with disgraceful charges against public men. New York was then governed by the worst methods of Tammany Hall, and the other cities were little better. Congress and the State Legislatures were supposed to be honeycombed with corruption. Even Judges on the Bench were accused of being bought and sold. It came upon me as a startling surprise; it looked as if the framework of Republican government was breaking up. I have followed the course of American politics these forty years, and observed endless attempts to uproot these evils, for the most part with imperfect success. The want of a trained and permanent Civil Service accounts for much of this. At that time every holder of an office, even a petty postmaster, went out with the President, and the perquisite of the victor was 100,000 appointments, great and small. Things have somewhat improved since then, and public opinion is ripening for a life tenure of non-political offices, but the city governments are still in many cases very bad. One point however impresses me more and more, the solid mass of honest and virtuous citizenship in America carries the nation successfully through every crisis. If the politicians are often unworthy of their great country, the patriotism of the citizen never fails when a serious demand is made on it. So untiring is the energy of the people, and so vast their resources, that they scarcely feel the petty plunder to which they are subjected. It is however, a great misfortune that so few young men of education and private means devote themselves to public life. They will come in time; and one hopes that the admirable constitution of what is bound to be the greatest country in the world will be administered in the future by men of the stamp of Lincoln, Garfield, and McKinley, who all fell martyrs at the shrine of national duty, and I may add that excellent citizen Seth Low, who has redeemed New York from anarchy. Looking back at my experience in 1860, and at an essay written in that year, I see plainly that I overrated this evil. I did not allow sufficiently for the tone of exaggeration that runs through the American press, nor for the unscrupulous attacks of party politicians. If we wash our dirty linen in public, the Americans flaunt theirs from every lamp-post; and a visitor is deceived by

the furious charges and counter charges at election times, which subside into silence as soon as the combat is over.

I sailed from Quebec by the Allan s.s. *Bohemian*, at the beginning of July, and had a delightful voyage home, the only really fine Atlantic voyage I ever had. It is a stormy ocean, and seldom can the crossing be made with much comfort. On my way home I planned the issue of a monthly cotton circular, which should focus the statistics of the trade, and its condition and prospects throughout the world. It was the first of the kind in England so far as I know, and it was started at the end of the year, and conducted by me till I went into Parliament in 1883. It aided not a little in establishing my business, and was a means of communication with all the leading cotton-fields of the world, as well as the chief manufacturing and commercial centres. It was followed some years after by the admirable circular of Mr. Thomas Ellison, which for fulness and accuracy of statistical knowledge has never been equalled, and which is still the chief authority in the cotton world.

I landed at Londonderry, and had a rapid run to the Giants' Causeway, and by Belfast to Dublin, and was struck, as on subsequent occasions, by the great industry and force of character of the Protestant population of the north-east corner of Ulster. That blend of Scotch, English, and Irish, but chiefly the two former, has produced one of the sturdiest races in the world. I found traces of them everywhere in America, and quite a number of the leading American firms, such as A. T. Stewart, and Brown Brothers, of New York, were of Scotch-Irish descent. No one can understand the Irish problem who does not know its racial history, and much of my time in later years was devoted to the study of Irish questions. I may say here that while we owe to Mr. Gladstone the first full and frank acknowledgment of national wrongdoing to the aboriginal Celtic and Roman Catholic population of Ireland, it always seemed to me that he scarcely did justice to the energy and moral force of the Protestants of Ulster. His scheme of Home Rule really broke down under their determined resistance. The cleavage between the two sections of the Irish population is deep and ineffaceable, and baffles every attempt of British statesmanship to overcome it. When racial difference is added to religious difference of age-long standing, it seems almost hopeless to bring about amalgamation or even mutual co-operation. Many of us who worked for long years under Mr. Gladstone's auspices to pacify

Ireland, and who were willing to go great lengths to wipe out the memory of a hateful past, are now sadly aware that we attempted the impossible. Yet we feel we did right to make the attempt. Great national evils are never cured by a single coup; but each sincere attempt softens the friction, and makes it easier for future generations to solve the difficulty. It may not happen in the lifetime of a Christian statesman that "He who goeth forth and weepeth, bearing precious seed, shall doubtless come again rejoicing, bearing his sheaves with him"; but it is true in measure if we take an age-long forecast of a nation:—

Knowing this that never yet
Share of Truth was vainly set
In the world's wide fallow;
After hands shall sow the seed,
After hands from hill and mead,
Reap the harvests yellow.
Thus with somewhat of the seer,
Must the moral pioneer,
From the future borrow;
Clothe the waste with dreams of grain,
And, on midnight's sky of rain,
Paint the golden morrow!

(*Whittier.*)

I returned to Liverpool from Dublin in a coasting-steamer, and suffered tenfold more from sickness and discomfort than in the Atlantic voyage. I do not know a more choppy or disagreeable crossing than the Irish Sea and its congener the English Channel.

CHAPTER IV

I commence Business on my own Account—The American Civil War in Relation to Trade

I HAD now to make up my mind as to my future course. It seemed perilous to launch into business on my own account at the age of twenty-four, without solid basis of support, yet there seemed no other alternative, and I decided to start on October 1, 1860, as a cotton-broker. But I first took a tour of the leading manufacturing districts of Lancashire, of which I then knew little or nothing. It was dreary work going through these smoky towns, and through the hot stuffy mills, which in those days had little ventilation, and were full of cotton fluff. The wan faces and sickly look of the operatives depressed me. I could not but feel that the cotton planters had something to say when they contrasted the stalwart frames of the negro slaves who grew the cotton, with the pinched and wizened faces of the white people—mostly women and girls—who spun and wove it. Many excellent regulations have been made since then to improve the sanitary conditions of the mills; the cotton operatives have greatly improved in many ways; yet there is much to be done, and I cannot but feel that those countries which are mainly agricultural have a happier lot than those which are mainly industrial. It is true that wealth accumulates faster in the latter: wages are higher, and luxuries are more easily attainable by all classes; but—

> Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
> Where wealth accumulates, and men decay.

It cannot be denied that the physique of the English people is not what it was at Crécy or Agincourt. However, it is not impossible that science may find ways of purifying the methods of manufacturing. In the days of which I write there was no attempt to consume smoke. A dark pall hung over all our manufacturing towns. It

esced in. Hardly any foresaw that the greatest crisis in the cotton trade was at hand. The largest crop on record (4,800 m.) had been made the previous season, and Liverpool held the largest stock ever known. A cotton famine seemed hardly possible, yet (O mens caeca mortalium!) we were on the verge of it! Soon after I commenced business there arose the wildest speculation that any living man has seen. Stage by stage the dread steps were taken that plunged the Union into Civil War. South Carolina began by passing a secession ordinance, and was followed by all the cotton states. The border States like Kentucky, Missouri, and Virginia, hung fire for a time, but ultimately followed, till practically the line of slavery co-existed with the frontier of the Southern Confederacy. Patriots on both sides shrank from the awful arbitrament of war. A thousand ties of relationship, of commerce and of religion, bound the great American Republic together. The fateful stroke was given by the State of South Carolina firing on the Federal Garrison of Fort Sumter at the entrance to the Bay of Charleston. Those guns vibrated through the Northern States, and exploded the magazine of pent-up anger. The whole country rushed to arms. President Lincoln appealed for 70,000 volunteers, who were immediately offered. These raw levies were disastrously beaten at Bull Run, Virginia, and many thought the war then practically over. Lincoln then appealed for 600,000 men, and this vast force was almost immediately raised by the Northern States. So sure were the New York papers that the South would give in, that I remember as though it were yesterday the confident predictions that the war would be over in ninety days! The South was equally convinced that the war would be ended by the intervention of England. A blockade of the Southern ports was instituted by the North, but so feeble was its navy that blockade-running became a business. The Southern people counted on England breaking the so-called "paper-blockade." To use the popular language, "the old grandmother sat upon a cotton bale," and would be forced from self-preservation to procure the life-blood of her commerce.

As the cotton famine approached, the price mounted up with fearful rapidity. 12*d.* per lb. was soon reached. The mills went on half-time; and by the summer of 1862, 2*s.* 6*d.* per lb. was reached, or five-fold the price in the summer of 1860! Gigantic fortunes were made by speculation. Almost every one plunged into cotton speculation: a single lucky *coup* made a fortune. Bu-

there is a Nemesis which dogs the steps of the eager fortune-hunter. Most of these speculators lost all they had when the tide ebbed away, and the recoil came after the war. They had lost their legitimate business and their habit of patient industry, and many of them sank into chronic poverty. It was pitiable to see men who had bought fine mansions and costly picture galleries, hanging about "the flags," watching the chance of borrowing a guinea from an old friend. During my first three years in business I strictly adhered to brokerage business, nor did I take any interest in cotton on my own account till I became a member of a merchant's house, James Finlay & Co., in 1864. I attribute what commercial success I afterwards had to the discipline of those years, but it needed not a little self-denial to abstain from what seemed so easy a way to fortune. If I may here digress for a moment, I may say that commercial success requires the concurrence of two contrary tendencies, caution and enterprise—caution in avoiding risks, in foreseeing consequences and in providing against contingencies, even remote ones. But this alone will not carry a man far. He must also have the eye to originate and the courage to strike, when a favourable opportunity occurs. He must know how to take risks when a reasonable chance offers. Above all, he must work for the future, not the present. He must realize that the slow upbuilding of character brings its reward in course of time. Of nothing am I more certain than that "Honesty is the best policy," if spread over a lifetime, and that there is no opposition between the "Golden Rule" and sound commercial success. I have seen the wrecks of countless speculators of phenomenal capacity, who neglected these simple rules. I doubt whether I ever knew of permanent success where the fundamental laws of honesty were not observed. It is true that the methods and rules of business alter from age to age. Traders often canonize into moral maxims the mere machinery of business. I have often heard grievous charges brought against men who had genius to initiate new departures in business; the breach with old customs was treated as a lapse from morality. Yet these great captains of industry who open up new paths of commerce are the real benefactors of a country. They develop trade which would otherwise go to our competitors. No doubt Watt, Arkwright, and Stephenson, by their inventions, pressed hard on the old-fashioned traders. Many of them who could not turn round quickly enough went to the wall; but for one man who lost his living they made room for

ten more, and they retained in Britain great trades which would else have emigrated to other lands. To compare small things with great, there are many quick, originating minds, who, without being inventors or explorers, have a faculty of seizing opportunities, and of foreseeing the trend of events. The sluggish and commonplace trader dislikes their competition, and charges them with taking advantage of him, but it is the law of competition which in all free countries is the life of commerce. Reckless speculation and dishonest modes of business are separated by a great gulf from the genius that foresees and devises new methods of trade. Let me add here that wide culture and accurate mental training tell in favour of commercial success—not perhaps in the earlier stages, but in the higher reaches of business. Minute scholarship is of little value, but the all-round training of a modern university, with its scientific and practical side, is of great value. On the other hand, an early start is also of importance. Few men who continue at college till twenty-four will submit to the drudgery of commercial life. Their tastes and habits have become formed; but a sound education carried on to eighteen or twenty is of great value. Where it can be done (as is common in Glasgow), attendance at a class in college may be continued for years after entering a counting-house. All kinds of knowledge act and react on each other, and what we call a sound judgment is the due balance and just proportion of a well-stored mind. In no department of life is there more need for this balance and proportion than in the higher walks of commerce. The head of a great firm dealing with foreign countries needs to be a statesman, an economist, and a financier, as well as a merchant. He must have the power of taking a bird's-eye view of the whole situation; like the general of an army, and like all great commanders, he must be able to discern talent, and promote it to high position. A first-class merchant does not burden his mind with a multitude of details, and is always seemingly at leisure, while intent upon great issues. Many such men have I known in the course of my life. The old British merchant as I remember him before the days of syndicates and limited liability, was often a truly great man, honourable, far-sighted, enterprising, yet withal prudent and cautious; simple in his life, and temperate in all things. The great fabric of British trade was built on these foundations. Trustworthiness and honour were the corner-stones of the building, and no nation will prosper long that lets go this sheet-anchor.

salvation. From this time forward my interest was intense in all that touched "things unseen and eternal." Discursive reading in former years had made me familiar with lax views of Biblical inspiration. I had just been reading the famous volume of *Essays and Reviews*, the first of which was written by Dr. Temple, now Archbishop of Canterbury! It was in those days supposed to be very rationalistic and dangerous in its tendency. How far it is out-stripped by the wild negations that permeate literature nowadays! Yet it had upon me an unsettling effect. My early faith in the literal infallibility of the Bible, especially of the Old Testament, was breaking up, and there was evolving a more nebulous form of Christianity—less dogmatic and more ethical—what is nowadays called "Broad Church." I imagine that this is the natural evolution of all men religiously trained and anxious to remain Christians, while not knowing experimentally the teaching of the Cross of Christ. Channing, Martineau, and Robertson of Brighton then considerably influenced my religious views. There is much that is admirable in the writings of these great men, but they lack the deeper note of New Testament theology: "the blood of Jesus Christ, God's Son, cleanseth us from all sin." Is not the true explanation of these spiritual phenomena given in the words of St. Paul: "The natural man knoweth not the things of the Spirit of God, neither can he know them because they are spiritually discerned"? It needs an inner revelation to show us that we cannot save ourselves, and that "Christ is able to save to the uttermost all that come unto God by Him." When once the soul is enabled to see this, all fancied self-righteousness disappears, and the beauty and perfectness of God's way of salvation shine into the heart. Is it not the fact that in every genuine case of conversion there is repeated the essence of our Lord's words: "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God." The intellect cannot of itself discern spiritual truth: "The wisdom of this world is foolishness with God." Hence many of the most powerful intellects have rejected the claims of Christ, and treated the experience of Christian believers as idle dreams.

These truths I had to learn through months of deep anxiety; but at last I got my feet on the rock, and found that my experience was exactly expressed in the well-known lines of Toplady:—

> Rock of ages, cleft for me,
> Let me hide myself in Thee:
> Let the water and the blood,

cruelty to children" in those days. The very idea of interfering between parents and children, or between husband and wife, was derided. When I began some years after to advocate such legislation I was regarded as a fanatic! There were also fearful times of distress caused by commercial panics, such as that of 1866, and by the bitter labour wars. Little consideration was shown by employers and employés for each other. Too often they viewed each other as natural enemies. There was little provision for the sick, either by nursing at home, or in hospitals. William Rathbone had hardly commenced his noble work. I sometimes saw people dying in close stuffy kitchens, surrounded by brawling children, all huddled together, with a sickening smell of drink and foul air. Coming home at night one often felt half-poisoned. This experience stimulated me to undertake social reform in after life, and to aid in the passing of many measures to improve the sanitation and home life of the poor. It taught me sympathy with human suffering, and gave practical knowledge of human needs. Indeed it is hardly possible for those who are brought up in the lap of luxury ever really to understand the needs of the poor. I became now an intense student of the Bible, spending about a year with a pious Scripture-reader in studying the Epistle to the Romans, reading an hour before breakfast. Theology and religious biography became my supreme interest. Among the books that then moved me I recall the memoirs of McCheyne and Hewitson, and a little later those of William Burns, the Haldanes, John Wesley, Mary Anne Schimmelpenninck, Joseph Sturge, Stephen Grellet, and especially that remarkable autobiography of George Müller of Bristol,[1] where he records how he was led to build his great orphan homes which at one time sheltered 2,000 children. What impressed me was his implicit belief in prayer. For some sixty years all the wants of these children were supplied without a single appeal for money. Though there was often but a single day's food on hand, invariably the supplies came in answer to prayer, so that not a meal was lacking!—as true a miracle as the feeding of Elijah by the ravens! It has always seemed to me that the life of Müller was as clear a proof of the overruling care of God as any demonstration of Euclid is in the region of pure mathematics. I also learned from Müller the immense importance of beginning the day by the devotional reading of the Holy Scriptures. During his life he read through the Bible 200 times, and found it equally fresh and new up to

[1] See Appendix II.

My early life threw me much into contact with two small bodies of Christians—the "Plymouth Brethren," as they were generally called, and the Quakers. Both influenced me considerably. For a time I was fascinated by the wonderful power the Brethren had of extracting spiritual truth from the Old Testament and by their unworldly lives, while the simplicity and contentment of the Quakers also charmed me. Yet longer experience taught me to distrust the extreme theories of verbal infallibility on which the Brethren then proceeded; I refer to such men as John Darby, and in a much less degree to George Müller. I found they were defective in charity to their fellow-Christians and quarrelled among themselves to a surprising degree. They demanded absolute concurrence in their systems of interpretation, and, as human minds differ, this was found to be impossible; and so it has happened that a sect started as a protest against priestly pretensions, and founded on the idea of the direct guidance of each believer by the Spirit of God, has been rent by divisions more than any other.[1] They held in these days—at least those I met with—that Christians had no right to take part in civil or political life: that it was wrong even to sit on a School Board or a Town Council, much less in Parliament; that this world being hopelessly bad and incurable, a Christian had to come out of it and be separate, and "touch not the unclean thing"; and so they took little or no interest in works of philanthropy. I soon came into collision with these good men when taking up philanthropic work, especially when I tried to get legislation to put down great social evils. I sometimes received letters lamenting my fall from pristine virtue, and even still get them occasionally. But the spirit of the age is wholly against these narrow theories, and they have ceased to influence any considerable number of people.

My Quaker friends were bound to me by many sweet memories of early manhood. They have played a valuable part in emphasizing the truth that Christ's kingdom is not of this world, but they seem to me to lack definiteness of Scriptural knowledge, and are better fitted for works of charity than direct evangelization. My lot has been to be thrown into contact with endless varieties of the spiritual life, and I have learned that all are needed to reproduce the perfect and many-sided life of our Lord. Most minds can only hold one or two leading truths, and so the whole Church needs the supply of these various types of the Divine life. As

[1] See that remarkable history of the Brethren by Blair Neatby (Hodder).

CHAPTER VI

End of the American Civil War—First Visit to India—Visit to Palestine—Constantinople—The Danube—Home Again

I MUST now resume the thread of my narrative. The years 1861–2 were times of intense excitement and speculation in the cotton-market. As the blockade of the Southern ports grew stricter and stricter, less and less cotton filtered through to England, and it became apparent that a cotton-famine was imminent. Many of the mills were closed; those that worked went on "short time," and prices shot up with fearful velocity—often pence per lb. in a week, till, as I said before, 2*s.* 6*d.* per lb. was reached in the autumn of 1862, or 500 per cent. advance from the bottom of the market in 1860. Great suffering was caused to the factory operatives. Hundreds of thousands were thrown out of work, and enormous relief works were started all over the manufacturing districts. If I remember rightly, some two millions sterling were raised by public subscription. Some of the wealthy firms paid half-wages out of their own pockets, even when their mills were closed. Great pressure was brought to bear on our Government to "recognize" the Southern Confederacy, and to break the blockade. The Emperor Napoleon urged England to join him in this policy; but our Government rightly adhered to absolute neutrality, and never went beyond treating the South as a "belligerent." Our greatest peril was with the "Trent Affair," when a Northern cruiser forcibly intercepted the Southern envoys, and took them out of a British steamer, contrary to the law of nations. Intense excitement was caused in England, and for a short time war seemed imminent. Lord Palmerston drew up a peremptory despatch and sent the Guards to Canada; but the Queen and Prince Albert, it is well known, softened the terms of the despatch, and made it easy for a proud nation to yield. And so that wise and patriotic ruler, President Lincoln, saved his country and ours from a terrific disaster by releasing the envoys (Mason and Slidell). The feeling was almost unanimous in Liver-

Statements were floating about and generally credited, that vast quantities of cotton existed in the interior of India: that nothing was wanted but railway communication to get supplies that would render us independent of America. I resolved to investigate the question and devote a winter trip to India; and, leaving my business in the hands of my brother James, I started at the beginning of November, 1862, travelling by the P. and O. from Marseilles to Bombay. In those days the service was a slow one. Our steamer was small and we encountered violent storms, and I suffered terribly from sea-sickness. On one occasion I witnessed the unusual sight of a waterspout in the Mediterranean Sea. Our brief run across Egypt was like the entrance into a new world. The first visit to the Orient is like going to another planet. I remember our drive to the citadel of Cairo as though it were yesterday. In those days there was just one good hotel, the old "Shepheard's," and Cairo was as in the time of "the good Haroun Alrashid," small narrow streets almost shutting out the sky, with bazaars running through them, in which cross-legged Turks sat smoking hookahs, too lazy to ask you to buy their wares. The modern Cairo is like a miniature Paris, full of splendid hotels and broad thoroughfares; but the Oriental portion still remains, to show what the Egypt of the Mamelukes was. The railway had then been opened to Suez, and we crossed by it and embarked on a much finer vessel, and proceeded down the Red Sea. I looked with intense interest on the peaks of Horeb and Sinai, and the lurid mountains of Arabia. The first visit of a Bible student to Bible lands is a kind of revelation. Ancient history gives up its dead; the past stands revealed before you.

I had no doubt then, and I have none now, of the substantial truth of the Exodus from Egypt, despite a "higher criticism" which resolves all ancient history into myths! Nothing strikes one more in the East than the persistence of historic tradition, and it is notable that all the early history recorded in the Pentateuch is supported by local Arab tradition to this day. We had a delightful voyage across the Indian Ocean. The passage in winter and spring is one of the finest in the world—always smooth and bright without being too hot. I made the acquaintance of one noted passenger, Sir Arthur Cotton, the great Indian engineer who irrigated the deltas of the Godavery and the Kistna, and thoroughly secured from drought a great mass of population. His conversations taught me the imperative need of irrigation in

India, and nearly forty years' study of India has only convinced me more and more that the secret of fighting famine in India is widespread irrigation, combined with moderate and fixed land assessment. The seeds of thought I got from Sir Arthur Cotton fructified into many speeches in Parliament on Indian affairs, in which I tried to enforce these primary truths; and I rejoice that our able Viceroy, Lord Curzon, has appointed a Commission, presided over by Sir Colin Scott Moncrieff, of Egyptian fame, to study the whole question of irrigation.

We reached Bombay about the end of November. The first appearance of that splendid harbour, encircled by hills, is very fine, and the first plunge into Indian life is weird and strange to a European—the streets crowded with semi-nude dark-turbaned figures, the feathery palm trees, the blazing sun, the exuberant tropical vegetation, the stately gait of the proud imperial race that rules this Empire of nearly 300 millions. The first impression is bewildering and almost overpowering. I was entertained at the hospitable bungalow of Finlay, Clark & Co. (now Finlay, Muir & Co.), on Malabar Hill, where my kind friend, Hugh B. Muir, was my host; there I spent some time studying intently the strange phenomena of this ancient civilization. My first and main object was to examine the question of cotton supply, and I resolved to take a series of trips into the cotton-growing districts of the interior. It was no easy matter in those days. Railways were just being laid down. The great G.I.P. had not been carried over the Ghauts, and it had not got so far as Nagpore. My first trip was up the line to Julgaum, near Berar. We rode over the Ghauts in a bullock-cart in the night-time. In Bombay the heat was great, even in December; the thermometer seldom fell below 75° or 80°. But I found it exceedingly cold in the Deccan at night. Sometimes in the "travellers' bungalows," which were little better than huts, the wind sifted in through the interstices of the mud walls, and made us glad to keep on our coats, even in bed! Yet the blazing sun was so strong in the daytime that unless one wore a sun helmet and carried a white umbrella there was risk of sunstroke. I remember once in Bombay standing in the verandah for a minute or two in early morning without my topee, and I nearly had a sunstroke. I have never been able to understand the peculiar intensity of the sun's rays in India. In other climes I have experienced equal heat with no tendency to sunstroke, but not so in India. On this trip I gathered less information than

on subsequent ones, but I quote from an old letter an account of a day's proceedings under the guidance of an intelligent Hindoo merchant, who placed his ghary at our disposal. I repeated this experience over and over again, and so gradually got the focus for Indian questions. I may add that for a time the only effect of interrogating the natives was to raise such a dust of contradiction and controversy as to obscure the question, and it was long before I could catch the right point of view and see things in proper perspective. This is true of all Indian questions. Europeans and Indians approach them from opposite poles, and appear at first in hopeless contradiction. But it is not so in reality. When you make due allowance for difference of terminology and get the proper focus, there is substantial agreement among men of common sense on both sides. Indian merchants are just as acute as Europeans, and can argue as soundly. Indeed, I have seldom seen keener reasoning than in some of the conferences I held. I proceed with my letter :—

January 1, 1863.

We started one morning about half-past seven in our friend's bullock cart, to go to Nusseerabad, a large native village six miles off. Our cart would remind you of a very small gipsies' caravan ; it has a thick circular cover over it, to protect it from the rays of the sun, without room enough for us to sit upright, so that we feel cramped and uncomfortable after a long ride, but it has springs—a luxury quite unknown in most country places—and is probably the most fashionable vehicle in the district.

We jog along for two hours, along a road which resembles in many places the bed of a torrent ; enormous ruts ingulf the wheels, and much carefulness is requisite to keep my fellow passenger and myself from dashing our heads against each other. The dust lies inches deep, and the country is flat as a pancake, the look-out most wearisome and monotonous. The fields are covered with young crops, just beginning to spring, with here and there old crops of ripe cotton partly picked. We meet numerous carts of cotton and other produce coming in to the railway station ; the drivers are not encumbered with the luxury of clothing, saving a narrow strip of calico. Panting with heat and dust we welcome the grove of trees that encompasses the village, and the sight of a cool stream that meanders through them is grateful to the eye. In this some Hindoo women are washing the garments of their lords ; they dip them in the water, and then beat them against a stone, using a shirt as our men do a flail—alas for the buttons ! Nusseerabad is surrounded by the mouldering ruins of a mud wall, like all the other villages in the Deccan ; these were built to secure them from the inroads of a wild predatory people called the Bheels, who inhabite the neighbouring mountains, and were, till a short time ago, robbe

steamer to the ancient city of Surat, and experienced the hospitality of two kind Presbyterian missionaries from the north of Ireland, Messrs. Glasgow and Montgomery. With them I made an expedition to a mission station in the interior among a primitive aboriginal tribe called the Dheds. We travelled all night in a bullock-cart under a brilliant moon, and next day we attended a series of services in the mission church, winding up with a kind of love feast in the evening. I remember that one of the natives was stung by a scorpion during the feast, and his convulsions were fearful to witness. I was impressed by the simplicity and earnestness of the whole of these proceedings.

My next trip was to the ancient and picturesque city of Ahmedabad, through the rich country of Guzerat. It was then the garden of Western India, covered with magnificent timber and great spreading banian trees, throwing down their suckers into the ground like the colonnades of a temple. Alas! that splendid country has been devastated by successive famines till I am told that a great portion of its forest trees have died out. The railway did not quite reach Ahmedabad, and I had to make my way at night on foot with a native servant to the city wall, and with some difficulty got the gate opened, and found the "Travellers' Bungalow" sadly dilapidated. We had left our cooking pots and provisions behind us, and could hardly get food at first; but a Hindoo judge kindly gave me a lodging in his house. I saw something of the Jain caste of Hindoos, which absolutely prohibits all taking of animal life. I obtained access to one of their temples and saw their worship. There remains vividly imprinted on my memory a night journey from Ahmedabad in a bullock-cart under an intensely bright moon. I quote from an old letter:—

> From time to time I woke up in a dreamy state as we passed through native villages, and curious clamour often arose from causes I could not account for. The people turned out to guide us on the way, or for some other purpose, and the shouting they made was astonishing. Then ever and anon we plunged into some stream, and the cattle forded it up to their girths. We passed mighty banian trees and old ruined temples, and the bright glare of the moon gave all a weird silvery look. But Indian travelling is intolerably slow, and instead of being at the station at 5 a.m., as was promised, I had to run on the last two miles by myself to catch the train, and had it not been behind time the luggage would have been too late. However, all went well, and I got on to Broach by midday.

From Broach I returned to Surat, and then had to organize a

up warily in the morning lest a snake had secreted itself under the coverlet.

It was impossible in those days to travel with any degree of comfort in India when away from the ordinary thoroughfares. The food eaten by the natives was such as a European could not digest—mostly a coarse kind of millet. The water was often execrable. I have seen it alive with insects when held up to the light. There were often no beds or bedding, and sometimes not a chair in the bungalow, and you had to carry your food and cooking apparatus. Sometimes for days we had to confine ourselves to tea, as the water was almost putrid. On one of my trips I passed through a district where the people were decimated by fever caused by foul water. The most elementary principles of drainage were unknown, and in places where rank jungle covered the soil there was constant malaria. I was glad to get back to civilized life in Bombay. It seemed the height of luxury after the hardships of country travelling.

But I had another long journey to make before I had in any sense covered the cotton-growing belt. A considerable part of the Indian cotton crop was grown in the southern Mahratha country, some 300 miles south of Bombay. Experiments were being made in Dharwar to get a finer and longer staple acclimatized, which might be a better substitute for American cotton, and I arranged with a friend of mine, Mr. G.—long since dead—to travel together and explore the country. It was no easy matter to reach these districts, as travelling facilities were almost unknown, and very few Europeans ever visited them. We took our passage by a coasting steamer to a new harbour in course of construction called then Sedashughur. There remains in my memory a vision of bright sunshine, deep blue sky, and a sparkling line of surf along the coast; and Sedashughur itself was like a Highland loch surrounded by mountains. The view from a hill overlooking the bay dwells in my mind as one of the loveliest I ever saw. A great road was in course of construction through the jungle as far as Dharwar, but it was not ready for travel, and we had to go by way of the little cotton port of Compta, and had to cross the intervening forty miles of jungle by what are locally known as "muncheels," a rude kind of palanquin. Before starting on our journey we fell in with Sir Bartle Frere, the able governor of Bombay, who was also exploring the district, and had an interesting interview, repeated in Bombay, when I discussed with him

the capabilities of India as a cotton-growing country. I may here state that Sir Bartle Frere impressed every one as a man of high aims and great intelligence. Indeed, he had a touch of genius, and I have often felt saddened at the apparent failure of his administration in South Africa; but it is due to him to state that many are of opinion that his policy, had it been fully adopted by the Home Government, would have spared South Africa the recent war.

We had an adventure on our journey to Compta, which I reproduce from my letters, as it illustrates Indian life in those days:—

We left Sedashughur on Thursday forenoon, and had made, as we thought, complete arrangements for getting on to Compta that night. We had written to the villages on the way to have bearers, or humals, as the natives call them, waiting for us on the way, and expected to have no interruption. The first stage of our journey was to a village ten miles distant, the whole distance to Compta being forty miles. I got into my muncheel, and was borne along by four naked coolies. Six men are attached to each muncheel, and two relieve the bearers alternately. It is a very luxurious conveyance. You lie full length in the hammock, and are protected by a screen from the rays of the sun, and you look quietly out on either side and enjoy the scenery, or read if you are inclined.

The scenery along this route was superb. Our road, or rather footpath, wound about the base of lofty mountains and along the shores of the sea. At times it ascended rocky eminences and looked down on the grand panorama below, and then it descended to the sandy beach, beside the rippling of the blue waters. The heat, however, was very great, sometimes rising to nearly 100° inside the muncheel and out of the rays of the sun. We enjoyed ourselves exceedingly till we came to the end of the first stage, where we expected fresh bearers to be waiting for us, but we found none. The message had miscarried, and no preparations had been made for us, and our own bearers were worn out and could go no further. We made every effort possible, but could not procure coolies sufficient to carry us on. Very fortunately I had heard of a German engineer who lived a few miles further on the way, and we resolved to walk to his place, and either get quarters or fresh men to take us forward; and off we started about 4 p.m. We also managed to get four coolies to carry our empty muncheels. Well, when we arrived at the place where the gentleman was said to live we tried to find his abode, but could not get any satisfactory answer. You may imagine our difficulties, for I could not speak a word of the language, and my friend only a few sentences. Besides, the people here speak a separate language of their own, called Canarese, little known in Bombay, and are more uncivilized than in most parts of India. The majority of them only wear a strip of cloth round the waist, and in appearance they look like savages; but they are a mild simple race,

and look up to the European almost as to a divinity. After much jabbering we got one of these people to guide us to the abode of the German, and off we started along a narrow footpath. But we walked mile after mile, and seemingly got no nearer, and instead of finding symptoms of a European habitation we got into the midst of a dense jungle. Our path got narrower and fainter, till it became scarcely perceptible ; the thorny prickly shrubs pressed so close that our muncheel got entangled and could scarcely be pulled through, and, worst of all, it grew dusk and thick darkness came on apace. On all sides of us, as far as the eye could reach, stretched a trackless wilderness : the ground was covered with a thicket of underwood, sometimes loosely scattered, sometimes so dense one could hardly force one's way through, and venomous reptiles crawled through these woods, and panthers, with smaller beasts of prey, abounded. Our prospect was not pleasant, and we were beginning to think our guide had lost himself, especially as he had shown symptoms of perplexity before. Still we pushed forward, for we thought it better to go on than to go back, as we might easily have lost the track in the dark ; but just as the last twilight was disappearing my friend, who was in advance, shouted out that he had found the main road, and sure enough we emerged from the jungle into a broad newly-made road, and felt ourselves perfectly at home. A few paces more brought us to the white tent of our German friend, and I can tell you it was a cheering sight.

We made no apologies for intruding. People do not think of these things here. Our host received us at once with the greatest cordiality, and to our astonishment we found he had his wife staying with him, a refined and courteous lady ; they were living here in the midst of the wilderness, without the ordinary comforts of life.

The husband was superintending the coolies engaged in making this new road, and his wife was left all day alone, and sometimes two or three days together, through the absence of her husband on distant stations. Wild beasts prowled about the huts at night, and snakes often found their way inside, and droves of naked coolies were encamped all round. It is wonderful what ladies sometimes undergo in this country.

Well, we laughed greatly over our adventures, and spent a pleasant evening. The German and his wife were both kind worthy people. We got a vacant tent to ourselves, and lay down on the floor. I was very tired, and slept as I never do at home. The feeling is like one of annihilation. One sometimes wakes in the morning with a sensation as though he were coming to life after being dead for some hours—the heat and fatigue bringing on such a deep sleep that the faculties get wholly quenched, and after such a sleep one feels wonderfully strengthened. Sometimes, however, mosquitoes or insects annoy you and make you feverish, and you get up in the morning languid and useless. I find that in India long sound sleep is invaluable. With it you can stand any fatigue, but without it you get utterly jaded.

This morning we got up at daylight, started at half-past six, after bidding good-bye to our worthy host, and walked five miles to the

nearest village to get bearers. There we were detained several hours before we could get coolies; but at last we got off and had no further mishaps, but reached here all right, though very tired, at eight o'clock last night.

In this journey of forty miles we have employed between thirty and forty men, and we will require twenty men more to-day to take us and our luggage another stage of ten miles, to Honore, where we purpose to stay over to-morrow. I tell you this to show you the difficulties of Indian travelling.

From Compta we went to see the famous falls of Gairsoppah—the Niagara of India. We had extraordinary difficulty in getting there owing to an outbreak of cholera in one of the villages; it was hardly possible to procure coolies or any kind of conveyance, and we had to do a good part of our journey on foot through a primeval forest of great trees, alive with monkeys and abounding in large snakes. I copy from one of my letters an account of some amusing adventures:—

We are now resting, in the heat of the day, at a little shanty in the midst of a dense forest. We have just had breakfast under a shady tree, and now our servants and coolies are preparing theirs. We slept last night on board our boat, on the river. It got quite cold and raw at night, and so heavy a dew fell that the planks of the boat were dripping in the morning. The coolies had nothing but a bit of cloth to throw over their shoulders, and when the morning broke they were shivering like icicles, but I do not suppose they were any the worse for it. I have seen the natives, up in the Deccan, sleeping in the open air, with the thermometer not far above the freezing point, with only a thin cotton sheet round them. I rather think the habit of going without clothing is not hurtful to the natives in hot climates, and in the summer time I should think it is quite a luxury!

The boat was anchored about three miles below the village of Gairsoppah. Our plan was to land there and walk twenty-one miles to our resting place for the night; we were therefore anxious to be on our feet as soon as possible, and started the boatmen at five o'clock. Light began to break about half-past five a.m., and the dawn upon the smooth waters of the river was glorious. You could not imagine a more sequestered scene. The stream (which is really an estuary up to this point) is about one hundred yards broad, and mighty forest trees crowd down to the margin of the water.

Some of these trees are very singular. The bamboo, in particular, grows here to an extraordinary size. It sends down countless stems to the ground, sometimes as many as one hundred or two hundred, and presents the appearance of a perfect thicket of interlacing shrubs.

We landed just before sunrise; the coolies disposed of the luggage on their heads, their usual way of carrying, and off we trudged in a long line. We passed through the village in which the cases of

cholera occurred, without any harm, and marched along a magnificent road up to this place, eleven miles from the landing. I fell in with an empty cart, and rode most of the way. The forest was so dense that we only got an occasional glimpse of the sun. The trees overhung the road, sometimes to the height of a hundred or a hundred and fifty feet. I think I have never seen a grander forest. The road ascended rapidly the whole way, and now, I should think, we are fifteen hundred or two thousand feet above sea level.

The river Gairsoppah runs beneath in a deep ravine, some one thousand feet below the road, and now and then reaches of the river open up of surpassing beauty. The scenery is like that of Killiecrankie, magnified tenfold. We arrived here about eleven o'clock, and as breakfast was preparing (the Indian custom is to have a cup of coffee as soon as you get up, and the regular breakfast several hours after), I rambled up the glade, and coming on a little eminence, overlooked the dry bed of a stream. From this started out two enormous serpents. One of them was lying coiled up, and I took it at first for the bough of a tree; it seemed as thick as a man's leg. The two immediately scuttled off, and one of them ran towards me. The monsters looked from eight to ten feet long. I am not ashamed to say that I turned tail and fled, for I never saw such ugly brutes; but, on asking the natives, I was told these great serpents are not poisonous. It turned out that the one which appeared to chase me was only making for its hole. My friend afterwards borrowed a gun from a Sepoy here, and fired at one of them, but did no execution. Another curious sight we saw was crowds of monkeys. We sometimes came upon a tree on which twenty or thirty of them were roosting, and, throwing up stones, sent them bounding in all directions. I have seen far more monkeys here than I did in Guzerat: the woods are swarming with them. Now I will close for the present, as the coolies are preparing for another start, and I must pack up.

It is much cooler here, and the temperature is not above 82° at noon.

Wednesday Evening, February 25, 1863.

I will now add another instalment. We walked the remaining ten miles of our journey yesterday afternoon, arriving here about dusk.

The travellers' bungalow here had walls and mud floors, and little else. It contained but one broken-down chair and no bedsteads, and we had to sleep on the hard floor. To-night we have got a lot of straw brought in, and expect to enjoy the luxury.

This morning we were astir with daybreak, and I sallied down in the direction of the stream, and crossing some ledges of rock, looked over the edge of a chasm eight hundred and ninety feet deep, over which the river Gairsoppah leaped at one immense bound. Strange to say, this extraordinary fall was only discovered by Europeans forty years ago, and so little is it still known that even in Bombay I could not find any one who could tell me where it was, while the name is not known in Europe; yet the scene I have witnessed to-day is one of the most sublime in the world.

excessive. At other places we had to force our way through thickets of brushwood that had never been pierced by man, keeping a careful eye on the caverns around, lest some beast of prey should be lurking there. We quite expected to fall in with monster serpents, perhaps get a peep at bears and other wild beasts, for these are numerous here about; however, we escaped the unpleasant sight, and got safely back again.

Altogether I have spent a very agreeable day, and one that will be long remembered. I only regret I could not see this place soon after the rainy season.

From Gairsoppah we made our way to Dharwar, travelling for four days in a bullock-cart at the rate of two and a half miles an hour. One night the cart was upset, and we were rolled on the road, but not hurt. Another night we lost our way in a dense cold fog. We passed through a country suffering from a deadly epidemic, some of the villages almost depopulated by fever. The water was shockingly bad. We could get nothing fit to drink on all this route, or food fit to eat. Large tracts of the jungle were on fire. Sometimes a belt of flame stretched for miles across the country, presenting a sublime spectacle by night.

Nothing strikes one more in India, when you leave the main roads of travel, than the large tracts of uncultivated land covered with jungle, which is usually a small scrubby undergrowth. Considering the huge population of India, it is wonderful that so much soil remains uncultivated. I understand that the total land under cultivation is about 200 millions of acres—far less than the area of Hindostan. This jungle land is very unhealthy, and if the natives try to reclaim it, they are often stricken down by fever. It usually lacks the means of irrigation, and nothing but dire necessity will drive population to settle on it. All the vacant land belongs to the Government from time immemorial, like the ancient unenclosed commons in England before the neighbouring landlords usurped the common rights. Strict forestry laws are now in force which preserve the timber from destruction—a very important matter in connection with the rainfall.

At Dharwar we stayed but a short time, and then returned to Bombay by Poona, travelling by the mail-cart, or dâk, as it is called, 270 miles. It was a curious experience. I extract from my letter:—

The mail-cart is a wooden box, seated on springs, with a low rail running round, and on this we perch ourselves, holding on by the rail, with little support for the back. Every six miles we change horses;

the bugle sounds as soon as we approach a station, and the horses are brought out ready harnessed. The horses are all taught to gallop at the highest speed, and you may imagine the rate we went at when I tell you that we accomplished the journey of 270 miles in thirty-four hours of working time, and that included the changing of horses and numerous breaks on the way. The general rate of going was twelve miles per hour, and one stage of six miles we accomplished in twenty-two minutes, or at the rate of sixteen miles an hour. The road too, at this part of the way, was exceedingly rough, being cut up by deep ruts and watercourses, and we bumped and bounded over these at a furious rate. Many of the horses we had were vicious brutes, and when put into the harness they reared and plunged and tried to lie down; but, after a hard battle, they generally gave in, and when once fairly started, never drew rein till they reached the next station.

We left Dharwar on Wednesday morning at half-past six, reached Belgaum, forty-eight miles off, at noon; started again at half-past four p.m., reached Kolapore at two a.m., seventy-three miles; left Kolapore at half-past three p.m., and reached Sattara, seventy-three miles, at one a.m.; started again yesterday at five p.m., and arrived here, seventy-three miles, at three a.m. this morning.

This sort of travelling gives one the idea of perpetual motion. We have been flying nearly all our waking hours, with wild horses, for three days, plunging up and down deep gullies, dashing through countless rivers, hurling past plains and hills like lightning—the whole thing floats before my mind like a dream. For the last ten days we have only had one or two full nights' rest, and I have not been in a bedroom the whole time till I arrived here. Even one's sense of time gets quite confused by this work; sometimes travelling most of the night and sleeping in the forenoon; then sleeping the first half of the night, and travelling the next half and all the following day; then travelling all night and sleeping as best we might in the day time, taking our food at all times; breakfast sometimes at six a.m., sometimes at two p.m.; generally not more than one regular meal in the twenty-four hours—it was a strange way of living for a quiet mercantile man from England!

When I reached Bombay I wrote a series of letters to the *Times of India*—then ably conducted by Messrs. Knight and Mull—describing what I saw of the cotton districts, and my impressions of their capability. I concluded that there was no basis for the belief that large stocks of cotton existed in the interior of the country, and that there was little chance of Indian cotton becoming a substitute for American, as it was far inferior in staple, and could not be radically changed; yet that the high price would draw a greatly increased supply so long as it lasted, for there was literally a stream of gold pouring at that time into Western India. These views were substantially confirmed by the result, for after the

American War was over, and ample supplies came from America at nearly the old price, the Indian supply fell back, or nearly so, to its old dimensions, and our spinners and manufacturers returned to the use of American cotton. These letters were published by me as a pamphlet in England, and I met the Committee of the Cotton Supply Association in Manchester, and fully explained the grounds of my opinion.

In Bombay I met some persons of exceptional interest. One of these was the Rev. John Wilson, D.D., a remarkable Scotch missionary, full of Indian lore, equally remarkable for piety and learning, and universally respected; also the Rev. Dr. J. Murray Mitchell, one of the ablest linguists in India, a man of wide knowledge and rare culture. He could read twelve or fifteen languages, and was abreast of Indian thought on all religious and philosophical questions. We formed a fast friendship, which has lasted to this day, and I am much indebted to him for my knowledge of India. He is now eighty-seven years old, yet vigorous in intellect.

I also made the acquaintance of several of the great Parsee merchants, who were famed for public spirit and liberality. I was struck by the great ability and powerful physique of the Parsees. This small community, scarcely 100,000 in all India, were mostly settled at Bombay or Surat, and had a great part of the trade in their hands. They are the remnant of the ancient Persian fire-worshippers, disciples of Zoroaster (or Zarathustra), who had been expelled by the Mahometan conquerors. They profited greatly by the huge rise in the price of cotton, and by the great speculation that was started in Bombay in financial and industrial companies. Several of them were then millionaires, and it was a wonderful sight to witness the stream of rich equipages that poured into the old Fort (as Bombay then was) from Malabar Hill. For an hour at a time they did not stop; it reminded one of Hyde Park during the season. This wonderful prosperity continued for two years longer. It led to a wild outbreak of speculation unparalleled in India. The shares of the famous "Back Bay Company" went up to 1000 premium. The trading community became intoxicated with sudden fortunes. And then the bubble burst! The American War came to an end; a terrific decline in prices occurred; and merchants, banks, and financial companies toppled over in a mass of hopeless wreckage. The British panic of 1866 synchronized with this collapse. Credit was withdrawn on all sides, and for years there was little else but enforced liquida-

season was late and the weather very hot, but I did not wish to lose the chance of seeing that land of sacred memories. So I engaged a dragoman in Alexandria, and took steamer to Jaffa (ancient Joppa) about the middle of May. I found the country deserted by tourists, and I hardly met an English-speaking person in my travels. In those days there was not a wheeled carriage in the country, and scarcely a passable road. The steam engine and railway had not desecrated the sacred soil. The primitive life of patriarchal times was still in evidence. I only saw one small hotel—at Jerusalem; travellers usually took their tents and camped out; but I had to share the hospitality of monks, and once was glad to lie all night *sub Jove frigido*. I rode on horseback all the way over roads that were sometimes like the bed of a stream, so broken were they by rocks and rolling stones.

The first view of Jerusalem was disappointing; the city was very small and poor, with only 15,000 inhabitants. It has grown greatly since then, and is now a refuge for thousands of poor Jews drawn to it by the Zionist movement, which deeply affects Jewish sentiment all over the world.

I quote from my letters written at the time:—

The sacred scenes of the Crucifixion we cannot now clearly identify, but modern superstition has erected a church called the "Church of the Holy Sepulchre." An ancient-looking venerable building it is, within which are located what they believe to be the Sepulchre of Christ, and the hill of Calvary. Though you feel that it is a mere invention, still it is with a feeling of reverence you come into the presence of such sacred names. The Church has a series of spacious halls, and in one of these, which is a circular apartment with a lofty dome, stands a square tower-looking erection, in the centre of the area. Into this you enter by a narrow opening and stand in a small circular chamber, from whose roof is suspended a large cluster of brass lamps; tall tapers are set round the room, and some of these are burning and keep up a "dim religious light." Inside this chamber or vestibule you observe solemn-looking monks and pilgrims kissing the image of a cross, which is carved above a small circular opening on the farther side; and then you see them, one after the óther, crawling on their knees through this opening into a still smaller chamber or grotto beyond. You follow them and emerge into the recess, and there you behold two or three men kneeling, with solemn face, before a white marble slab, above which is sculptured on the wall a figure of the Crucifixion. An atmosphere of religious awe fills this little sanctuary, and, in the eyes of millions, it is the holiest spot on earth, for here is supposed to be the identical sepulchre in which the body of the Lord was laid.

The grand opportunity for seeing the Holy Sepulchre is during

CHURCH OF THE HOLY SEPULCHRE, JERUSALEM

Photo by Frith & Co., Ltd

fell down by the road side. When I inquired what had become of him, some time after, I was coolly informed that the man was very ill and could not walk further, and that he would be eaten up by wolves before morning. Well, I was horrified at this, and was revolving how I could act "the good Samaritan" to him, when I learned that one of the guards had ridden back to find him, and soon after I was glad to see him galloping up with the negro upon his horse, and so he was brought safe to Jericho. The further we travelled the wilder the road got. It ran through deep gorges in the hills, along the brinks of steep precipices, and over shelving rocks, where the horses could hardly keep their footing. One of the guards struck out into the mountains to keep a look out, in case any roving Bedouins should be about, and I could see his horse faintly imaged on the horizon, on the crest of some mountain far above us, as the darkness was coming on. Our other guard disappeared behind to watch the rear. Now and again we could hear them shouting in the far distance, and then we would hear the clattering of the horses as they galloped up to us. It was a very wild romantic scene altogether. Shortly before dark we passed some droves of Arabs, with their camels and asses—wild fierce-looking fellows, with long guns slung behind their backs, and sometimes pistols and knives in their belts. We would have met rough usage but for our guard. Well, at last it got very dark. There was no moonlight, and the road seemed to increase in badness. Sometimes I lost sight of all the company, and was glad to let the reins loose on the neck of my horse, and leave him to follow the clattering of the horses ahead. At times, in the darkness, it seemed as if we were scrambling down a steep staircase; the horses' hoofs scraped and slipped over smooth shelving rocks, and you felt that a false step would send horse and you rolling down heels over head; but these Arabs are wonderfully sure footed, and seldom come down. It would be madness to ride English horses over such roads. But neither the hardness of the roads nor the danger of robbers were half so bad as the intolerable heat. When I left Jerusalem, the day, though sultry enough, was not unpleasant to me; but the further we descended the closer and hotter it got, till at last it was literally suffocating; not a breath of air stirred, and my head grew dizzy and half stupefied. I never felt anything like it in India. I suppose the sun, blazing all day on these deep defiles, and the reflection of its rays from the white cliffs, had filled the ravine with rarified unwholesome air. It just felt as if the fumes of an underground furnace had collected there. But, besides this, you must know that the vale of the Jordan and Dead Sea (on which Jericho stands) is 1,300 feet below the level of the sea—the only instance of such a phenemenon in the world, I suppose. It appears that the volcanic eruption which destroyed the "cities of the plain," and formed the lake called the Dead Sea, must have sunk the land far below its original level, and now it presents the extraordinary phenomenon of a deep fissure, so to speak, in the crust of the globe. This partly accounts for the excessive heat that prevails in this valley.

Well, at last, to my great relief, we saw the lights of Jericho glittering in the plain below, and soon we emerge from the mountain pass to

level ground. After riding a little further a refreshing sense of coolness is felt, and soon we come upon a little stream. It is a tiny brook, a mere handful of water, but it has produced a sweet oasis in the wilderness, and imparted a vapoury coolness to the air. I bathe my head and face in the flowing water, and our horses take a long draught. This little brook is the Cherith where Elijah hid during the three years' famine. Still we have a long ride before we reach the lights, and the air gets as choking as before. At last we tramp into the midst of an Arab encampment. It is a wild scene. Parties are sitting or lying under the trees, around bright fires, and the women are cooking their supper. Numbers of them are sleeping on the ground, in front of their rude huts, and we must take care not to step on their sleeping bodies. My dragoman talks to the sheikh, i.e., the chief or head man of the place, and I got a place to lie on. It is a circular mound of baked mud. One of these is in front of each hut, and the Arabs sleep on them during the hot weather. My man has brought a camp bed, and I stretch myself on it in the open air. It is about ten o'clock, and we have been six hours going to Jericho; but the heat and fatigue make it seem far longer. The choking stifling heat still continues, so that one cannot sleep, however tired he may be; and besides, a flock of goats is encamped within a yard of my head, and keep up a constant bleating. So I lie half-dozing, half-waking, panting for fresh air, and thinking with dismay of encountering the burning sun to-morrow on the plain of the Dead Sea. I am half-resolved to start before daybreak, and get back to Jerusalem as fast as I can, for the valley appears like "the valley of the shadow of death"; but I waken from one of those dozes with a feeling of dampness. I look up to the heavens, and see light fleecy clouds moving over them. A delicious sense of coolness is felt. Some vapour has arisen from the earth, and moistened the torrid air. It is an immense relief, and my spirits rise at once. About four a.m. I am roused up with the first glimmering of dawn, and before five we start for the Jordan, the Sheikh of Jericho accompanying us. We ride through a dry baked-up plain for an hour and a half. The powdery earth breaks under the horses' feet. The morning, however, is cool and pleasant, and I enjoy the scene immensely. A few miles to the right stretch the waters of the Dead Sea; behind us are the savage mountains we have ridden through, and before us are the dark lurid hills, on the other side of Jordan, that formerly belonged to the Ammonites and Moabites. Among these are the Peak of Pisgah and Mount Hor, where Aaron was buried; but of course we cannot identify them. There are still no signs of the Jordan, till suddenly we approach a rich strip of verdure; a long line of trees and bushes and sweet green foliage run along the valley. We ride into the thicket and come abruptly on the rapid running Jordan. The first view of it is most refreshing. Running water is a blessed sight in this weary wilderness: the very ripple of its waves is music to the ears.

I dismount, lie down on the bank, and try to call up the wondrous scenes enacted near this very spot. It was close to this that the children of Israel passed, that Elisha divided the waters after Elijah

went up to Heaven on the other side; and it was close to this place that Jesus was baptized. And then a little way on the right is the living monument of the judgment upon the "cities of the plain." I am indeed sitting on one of the most memorable spots in the world. After resting awhile I take the wonted bathe. The current of the river is very fast. It is too deep to ford. It is about the size of the Tweed or the Clyde at its mouth. At times it is swollen much above this; but, again, it is sometimes so low that men can wade across it. The channel is about twenty or thirty yards broad. I linger at the Jordan about an hour, and leave it with reluctance; but the sun is getting up in the heavens, and I am afraid of being caught in this valley with the extreme heat of day. So we ride off rapidly towards the Dead Sea, and reach it in an hour.

Now I am on the shore of the far-famed lake, respecting which such marvellous stories are told, and can verify them for myself. It seems five or six miles broad at this end, and resembles in size a large highland lake. It is forty miles long, but I cannot see far down it owing to the haze. Dark lurid mountains of a reddish hue encompass it, and the country around seems baked with heat.

I have heard curious stories about the effect of bathing in it—that the body is covered with slime, which cannot be got off, and that the water is so buoyant you cannot sink in it. I first try a mouthful, but spit it out at once. The skin of my mouth burns as if I had taken a spoonful of peppermint. The taste is intensely bitter, like very acrid Epsom salts. A single drop tastes the mouth for many minutes and can hardly be got rid of. I plunge into the clear waters, which are most inviting in the heat, and I find at once I am in a new element. It is true that you cannot sink; you bob in the buoyant water like a cork, and when you swim it is difficult to keep your feet from kicking into the air. You can float on your back with your head and neck out of the water, and I stood with great ease at full length, with my arms stretched out to balance me, and my head and shoulders above the water. This wonderful buoyancy arises from the extraordinary proportion of salt in the water, which is five times greater than in the ocean. But I detected no slime whatever on my body, and felt no inconvenience from the bathe. Moreover, I saw plenty of birds flying over the sea, which shows the folly of the old fable that no living thing could fly over it.

After spending about an hour on the shore I remounted my horse and turned my face towards Jerusalem. The road homewards first leads through a long winding defile, with walls of white gravelly sand, and then we commence the ascent of the mountains. We are travelling about six miles south of the road we took to Jericho, and through the famous "wilderness of Judaea." And, indeed, it is a wilderness! For utter desolation I have never seen the like. For hour after hour we climb these steep glistening hills under the burning midday sun. Not a tree was visible, nor any vegetation but some stunted withered shrubs, which looked as if they had been powdered. The intense whiteness was trying to the eyes. The hills looked as if they had been scathed by fire and sprinkled with whitened ashes. We could get no shelter of any

like vast meadows, with green crops. The sides of the hills were laid out in terraces, and upon these grew, tier above tier, belts of corn and groves of fruit trees; the vines clambered over the walls. Not a nook or corner of ground but was put to some use.

Our route lay through the open country, and, like all the roads in Palestine, was a mere bridle path. No hedges or ditches confine the fields; no fences arrest you. Nothing prevents you from riding in any direction. You feel a delightful sense of freedom in roaming through this open country. Of all ways of travelling this is by far the most interesting and instructive. I greatly enjoyed this day's ride. I was much struck with the kindliness of the soil and the warm genial look of the country. The soil, no doubt, was very thin, and limestone rock cropped out in all directions; but wherever the plough could be put in a crop at once sprang up. I believe two or three crops can easily be raised within the year, and the soil seems never to get exhausted. You could not conceive a sweeter country for a simple agricultural people. No wonder the ancient Jews clung so closely to these lovely vales. We rode on the whole day, with only a pause for breakfast, and reached our halting place just at dusk. It is a large Mohammedan city, called Nablous, situated in a lovely vale, between Mounts Ebal and Gerizim, in the heart of Ephraim. We were very tired when we arrived there, having taken two ordinary stages in one. We traversed some dark lanes and pulled up in a dingy and remote quarter of the city, where a cluster of old stone houses hung together. We penetrate into these through curious alleys, redolent of dirt and stench, and get into a sort of courtyard. I follow my dragoman, for I trust implicitly to him, and he lands me in an odd-looking chamber, like a prison.

In this dingy court reside all that remain to the present day of the ancient Samaritans, and I am lodged at one of their houses. The history of this little sect is most curious. The whole number of the body is only sixty, and they still continue their ancient rites and ceremonies, and reckon themselves as superior to the Jews. They have a little synagogue where they meet at stated times, and I saw there an old worn-out manuscript of sheepskin, on which was written, in Hebrew characters, a copy of the Pentateuch. They believe that this is the identical copy written by Moses, and it is all they receive of the Bible. I had a good deal of conversation with their high priest, but he, like the rest of them, is grossly ignorant, and they can give no reason for their belief except that it is handed down from their ancestors. They still look for the Messiah, and every year they go to the top of Gerizim, and live twelve days there in tents, and offer the passover according to the law of Moses.

On Tuesday morning I was roused up early, intending to take another long journey, but every fibre of my body cried out for repose, and I resolved to spend the day at Nablous, and give the poor horses a rest as well. The fruit of that rest was a portion of the foregoing letter. In the afternoon I climbed Mount Gerizim, and obtained a splendid view. The rich valley of Nablous lay like a carpet below, and rolling hills, with verdant patches between, followed each other in long suc-

cession like the waves of the sea. On the west I saw the gleam of the Mediterranean. Far away to the North I could just discern the Alpine peak of Hermon streaked with snow. The East was bounded by the lofty mountain range of Gilead, beyond Jordan, and the South by the hills of Judaea, so that my eye ranged over a large part of Palestine. The top of the hill is encumbered with great masses of ruin which some have supposed to be the remains of the ancient temple of the Samaritans, but more sober critics have judged to be those of a Roman Fort. I saw the circular hole where the Samaritans still roast the paschal lamb, and some of the ashes I have carried away with me. On this hill stood six of the tribes of Israel to bless, while six stood on Mount Ebal to curse, when Joshua read the book of the Law. The scene is famous in Jewish history. Nablous itself stands on the site of the ancient Shechem, where Jeroboam set up his throne. Below the hill are the ruins of Jacob's Well, of which the fourth chapter of John gives an account, and there I sat in the gloaming and read the narrative. I was well pleased with my day at Nablous. The city itself has a bad reputation. The people are fanatical Moslems, and the few Christians in the place have often been attacked and some of them murdered. We heard a report that a feud had broken out between it and another place on our way, called Jenin, and that the road was not safe. We had no resource, therefore, but to push on next day to Nazareth, and get there before dark. Most of the robberies are committed after dark, and if you arrive at a safe halting place before dusk you are comparatively safe. We were therefore astir very early on Wednesday, for we had a very long journey before us and at five a.m. we were wending our way through the groves of fig and mulberry trees that encompass Nablous.

This was another lovely day. A refreshing breeze blew from the sea, so that the heat was not at all oppressive. Light snowy clouds skimmed over the deep blue sky. A feeling of gladness pervaded nature. I think I have never seen such exquisite weather as I had in Palestine these last few days. Our route this day still lay through hill and vale till we reached Jenin, after a seven hours' ride, and then we opened up the magnificent plain of Esdraelon, and caught the richest view I have seen in Palestine. This plain comprehends most of the tribe of Issachar, and stretches from the sea to the Jordan. It is wonderfully rich, but is much exposed to incursions of roving Bedouins from beyond the Jordan. At Jenin we stopped for breakfast, and I watched with some suspicion some ugly characters who gathered round us. No one molested us, however, and we soon got under way again, and urged our horses fast across the broad plain of Esdraelon. We passed the base of Mount Gilboa, where Saul and his sons perished, and the site of the ancient Jezreel, where Ahab and Jezebel reigned, and the tragedy of Naboth's vineyard occurred. We passed through the village that occupies the site of Shunem (the city of the Shunamite widow), where the host of the Midianites was routed by Gideon. Then we passed near to Mount Tabor, the scene of the Transfiguration, and towards sunset began to climb the wooded hills,

among which the town of Nazareth nestles. Just at dusk we reached this interesting place, and got comfortable quarters at the Latin Convent. We had done a great day's work, and must have ridden fifty or sixty miles, but I felt very little fatigued ; the constant charm of the weather, the scenery and the associations, put away all thoughts of weariness. Nazareth is a modern city of some 4,000 people, prettily situated on the slopes of little hills. One of these I climbed next morning at sunrise, and got a beautiful view. I felt sorry that I had not time to stay at Nazareth, but next morning we were off again at seven, for we had to ride some twenty-five or thirty miles and catch the steamer at Haipha

Again we had a lovely day, and a most delightful ride along the base of the wooded Carmel, and reached our destination about one p.m. Within an hour or two the steamer hove in sight, and that night I was on my way back to Alexandria.

I returned home by way of the Levant and Constantinople, calling at the beautiful port and city of Smyrna, and passing those lovely islands of the Aegean, where early Greek civilization achieved such triumphs. I quote from my letters the following account of my visit to Constantinople, and the sail up the Danube :

In the afternoon we entered the Sea of Marmora, which, if you consult the map, you will perceive to be a bead, as it were, on the string that connects the Black Sea with the Archipelago, and on Sunday night we were still passing through it. On Monday morning we were astir by daylight, on the look out for that first and glorious view of Constantinople, which many travellers declare to be the most superb in the world. About six a.m. the tops of minarets begin to appear, and as we sweep round a bend of the land the queenly city opens out before us. It is, indeed, a grand sight, but a slight haze hovered over the horizon, and rather dimmed the splendour of the view ; besides, I had been so excited with glowing accounts of this spectacle, that I must honestly confess to a little disappointment. I always try now to hear as little as possible about scenery till I come upon it myself, for I am generally disappointed when I learn too much before. Your most delightful sensations are when you come upon striking and beautiful scenes totally unawares, and that I have often done upon this journey, by travelling alone and knowing little about the countries beforehand.

But Constantinople is a splendid city, as seen from the sea. It is girdled round by the pure waters, and bathes its feet in them on all sides. A long fork of the sea, called the "Golden Horn," runs right through the heart of the city, and divides it into two parts : the southern and principal segment is the Turkish part, styled Stamboul by the natives, and the other portion is called Pera and Galata, where Europeans reside. Across the frith is the great suburb of Scutari, where the English hospital stood in the Crimean War, and on all the projecting heads of

land villages are built, so that the water appears like a lake with numerous arms and bends winding through the heart of a large metropolis, but the stranger is most struck with the tapering graceful minarets of the mosques. They spring up in pairs, sometimes in fours, like the stems of tall slim trees. These mosques are stupendous buildings, some of them nearly as large as St. Paul's.

We landed about eight o'clock, and I went to Misserie's Hotel, kept by an Englishwoman, and found it more English looking than any I had yet visited in the East. It is very curious, as you travel homewards, to observe the increasing English complexion of things. One foreign custom after another is dropped, and old homely ones substituted. For instance, we have had for a long time nothing but wine for breakfast, a light French claret, which is very wholesome, but not palatable to a Briton at such an early hour; but here the familiar tea and coffee appear again.

Yesterday I first hurried down to get my home letters, and after that sallied out to explore the town, and rambled a good deal up and down its narrow streets. The grandeur of Constantinople does not bear close inspection; it does not possess a street so clean and well paved as most British villages can boast of. But in this respect it is like all Eastern towns. They are one and all a tangled labyrinth of crooked alleys, dark, narrow and ill paved. There is not one street in a hundred broad enough to drive a vehicle in; it is all you can do to tread them on foot, always looking out lest a donkey pushes you against the wall with its panniers, or a tall camel upsets you in the gutter. Constantinople is neither better nor worse than its neighbours. It is very difficult to get into the mosques here. The Turks are fanatical Mohammedans, and don't like to see the infidels, as they call us, profane their sacred places; but money will accomplish almost anything in this world, and it will unlock the door of most of these mosques.

I went through one of the finest yesterday—that of Sultan Achmet; the interior was nearly as grand and imposing as that of St. Paul's. The most famous of all is that of St. Sophia, which was originally built by Constantine, the first Christian Emperor of Rome, then rebuilt by Justinian II., in the seventh century, as a Christian Church, but converted by the Mohammedans into a mosque. I made an attempt upon it yesterday, but could not get in. I intend trying again to-morrow.

Kustenjee, Friday, June 5.

I now continue my letter from a little port on the Black Sea, where we have to wait some time for the train that takes us to the Danube. It is a cold bleak uninteresting place. My last letter was dated on Tuesday. The next day was the pleasantest I spent at Constantinople. I visited the grand mosques of St. Sophia and Suleimanye, and was much impressed by their magnificence. After that I rode round the crumbling walls of the city, and enjoyed it greatly. These are the ancient fortifications which repelled for many centuries the attacks of the Moslems, and were the bulwark of Christendom. They extend for several miles, and have a venerable appearance. All round the

outskirts stretch spacious cemeteries, shaded by dense groves of Cypress trees, which give a solemn funereal look to the ground. I also ascended the tall Seraskier tower, and got a splendid view of the city and neighbourhood. Yesterday afternoon we left Constantinople at three p.m. by the Austrian Lloyd's steamer, bound for the Danube and Vienna. The day was bitterly cold and stormy, and I could not keep myself warm, even with winter clothing on. We passed through the Bosphorus, and soon entered the stormy Euxine, and had rather an uncomfortable passage to this little port. If you look at the map you will find that the Danube approaches the Black Sea before taking a bend to the North. Across this neck of land there is a railway, and by means of it we avoid the necessity of entering the river at its mouth, and save a long detour. We start this afternoon, embark on the Danube in the evening, and hope to reach Pesth on Monday.

ON THE DANUBE ABOUT THE AUSTRIAN FRONTIER,

Monday, June 8.

I now continue my letter from the deck of the river steamer, about half-past eight on a beautiful morning, in the midst of splendid scenery. The former part of this letter was penned at the little railway station of Kustenjee, on the Black Sea. That same afternoon we crossed the little neck of land to the Danube, and I caught the first glimpse of that noble river about sunset. It is a majestic stream of great size, looking to the eye nearly as large as the Mississippi, though, of course, it brings down much less water. The average breadth is about half a mile, sometimes more, sometimes less, and the water is brown and muddy. We had a most tedious wait at a little station there till after midnight before the steamer arrived. The first sight of the steamer reminded me of those I had seen on American rivers—a long flat-bottomed boat, with raised galleries, and remarkably comfortable—more comfortable, I think, than American steamers, though not so large.

On Saturday morning I got up and began to explore matters. We had a large company on board—Russians, Austrians, and all sorts of foreigners, with a little party of Scotch people, some of them from Edinburgh, with whom I soon scraped an acquaintance. The whole day we steamed up the river, but the scenery was very tame—low, flat banks on either side, and dirty straggling villages. On the north bank we had Wallachia and Moldavia, and on the south European Turkey. The same dullness continued yesterday till the afternoon, when we approached the confines of the Austrian empire, bounded by the Carpathian Mountains. The banks of the river now became steep and beautifully wooded, and the scenery very interesting. The stream is pent into a narrow channel, and at one place forms rapids, where the water eddies in a tumultuous manner. About five o'clock we reach the little town of Orsova, which is the outpost of the Austrian dominions. It is a sweet spot, enclosed by wooded hills, and very like some of our highland glens. Here we changed steamers and went into one of

FLUELEN, LAKE OF LUCERNE

Photo by Photochrom Co

lighter draught, and tarried all night. I landed and had a silent stroll before sunset, and was greatly pleased by the loveliness of the scene.

This morning I was up by five and we set sail about six, and since then have been passing through scenery of remarkable grandeur. For several miles the banks overlook the river to the height of one thousand feet or thereabouts, almost perpendicularly, and the stream was pent into a narrow gorge, some two or three hundred yards wide. It was the pass of Killiecrankie prolonged for several miles, with a mighty river rolling through it. This sublime pass is known by the name of "The Iron Gates," and a very good one it is. And now, as I write, the river is swelling out into winding curves, making beautiful bays among the wooded hills, and in some of these little villages are nestling. Just now we approach a narrow strait, and I see the foaming waters swirling over. The stately vessel is ploughing its way up, and soon we will shoot over that line of foam. Now we are passing through the surf, and it causes a tremor in the ship, and it reminds me a little of the rapids of the St. Lawrence, though not so fierce as they; but the scenery on the banks is far finer than on the St. Lawrence. I look up now to richly-wooded hills, shelving down to the water's edge, and I see the mouths of numerous glens peeping out between them, and there are strips of green pasture land along the brink. Just above me on the right is a stupendous rock, with a smooth upright face several hundred feet high. It raises its craggy head out of deep thickets, and frowns down upon the waters gloriously.

I now close up this letter at a little place called Bazias, where we take the railroad for Pesth, the capital of Hungary.

I returned home by Buda Pesth and Vienna—both splendid cities—and reached Liverpool about the middle of June. This was the most interesting trip I ever made. I travelled nearly eight months incessantly, journeying among peoples speaking twelve or fifteen languages, often with only a native servant, and obtained an acquaintance with Oriental life which stood me in good stead afterwards. From a business point of view it was of great value, as I formed a permanent connexion with India, and next year entered into partnership with a Bombay firm. My health was greatly improved by the open-air life and constant sunshine. During my whole journey I hardly encountered a shower of rain!

CHAPTER VII

Business Career and Marriage—Domestic Life at Liscard Vale—Second Visit to America—Holiday Trips to Switzerland

AND now I had to address myself to a long and arduous business career in Liverpool, but the early difficulties had disappeared, and business flowed in on all sides. My brother James managed affairs so well in my absence that on January 1, 1864, I took him into partnership, joining my good friend, Mr. E. E. Edwards, and so we launched the firm of Smith, Edwards & Co., cotton brokers. I was soon after asked by the eminent firm of James Finlay & Co., Glasgow, to open a branch of their house in Liverpool, and did so on March 1 of that year, and through them I became a partner in their Bombay house. For several years I had a large business with America and India, as well as in Liverpool, and a few years later we added a cotton-spinning and manufacturing business, through the purchase of two large mills at Millbrook, near Staleybridge, which are managed to this day under the auspices of my friend Mr. Lowe on behalf of two private companies.

But a far more important partnership must now be mentioned. It is said that marriage either makes or mars a man. I was favoured to obtain a wife who for nearly thirty years was my true and faithful helpmeet, my inspirer in all that was good, my comforter in all sorrows, my wise counsellor in all difficulties. No union was ever more perfect. The words of Wordsworth were fulfilled to the letter :—

> And now I see with eye serene,
> The very pulse of the machine.
> A being breathing thoughtful breath
> A traveller betwixt life and death.
> The reason firm, the temperate will,
> Endurance, foresight, strength and skill;

A perfect woman, nobly planned,
To warn, to comfort, and command:
And yet a spirit still, and bright
With something of an angel light.

was married on July 20, 1864, to Melville Christison, daughter the Rev. John Christison, D.D., who was for fifty-two years respected parish minister of Biggar, in Lanarkshire; a man much culture and fine literary taste, whose memory is still green ong his old parishioners. We had known each other for years, l had the same views of life and similar training in youth; l I think I may say with truth that we never had a difference life. Our wedding trip to Switzerland is the brightest recollec- n of my life. A first visit in splendid weather to the Bernese erland, Lucerne and Chamounix, is never to be forgotten. It med almost too much happiness for human nature to bear. stands out in memory like a patch of brilliant sunshine against lark background. Wave after wave of trouble has been the of later years, and those joyous times seem like a forgotten lody, but I cannot believe that such hallowed experiences pass o the limbo of unreality. The warp and woof of human life ompounded of joy and sorrow, and the life to come will bear impress:—

We see but dimly through the mists and vapours:
Amid these early damps.
What seem to us but sad funereal tapers,
May be heaven's distant lamps.

There is no death: what seems so is transition:
This life of mortal breath,
Is but a suburb of the life Elysian,
Whose portal we call death. (*Longfellow.*)

he closing years of the American Civil War were times of violent tuations in the cotton market. As it became clearer that the th would succeed sudden panics occurred, and sometimes a of 4*d.* per lb. took place in a week. Business was difficult and gerous. Such a panic occurred soon after my marriage, and ther even worse when the war came to an end in 1865. The ectation then prevailed that a flood of cotton would be re- ed from the South when the ports were opened, but this expec- on was not fufilled. Much less cotton was available than was posed, and another great rise and large speculation occurred 1866. Then came the severe commercial crisis identified with

the failure of Overend, Gurney & Co. Many failures took place; credit was greatly shaken; and a severe panic occurred in the cotton market, which fell in one week from 18*d.* to 14*d.* per lb. But 1867 was without exception the most trying year in modern times. The price of cotton fell (if I remember rightly) every week without exception from 15*d.* to 7*d.* per lb., at which it stood at the end of the year. Yet I was mercifully enabled to steer the ship safely through the rapids, though the strain was very great.

I must now return a little to domestic history. We made our home at Liscard Vale, New Brighton, in a sweet situation embosomed in trees, and with grounds reaching to the shore of the Mersey; and there we spent some ten happy years. They were the most reposeful period of my life. Though business was engrossing and sometimes anxious by day, all was peace and quietness in the evening, and I look back with pleasure to many volumes read aloud by my wife, and to delightful visits from family friends. Those who enter public life have to make many sacrifices, chief of which is the loss of the domestic hearth. Our first-born child —a son—came to us in September, 1865, and the reaper Death took away the darling two months after, to our great grief. One of the happiest occupations of my life was in connexion with a mission carried on by our church at Seacombe, and for several years I took the Sunday evening service on alternate days with our valued missionary, Mr. Brown. My health at times showed signs of giving way under the strain of business, and I made a trip with my wife to America in the autumn of 1866, partly on business and partly for health and recreation. We spent fully two months travelling, in the delightful weather of "the Fall" or Indian summer, as it is called in America, when the foliage is a blaze of rich colouring. Our route was by Boston, New York, the Hudson, Lake George, Montreal and the course of the St. Lawrence, by Toronto to Niagara, where we spent some days; then by Buffalo, to that wonderful emporium, Chicago—before the great fire devastated it; thence to St. Louis, and back by Cincinnati, Washington, and Philadelphia to New York. The most striking event was our visit to the battlefield of Gettysburg, the Waterloo of the Civil War, where the Southern army under Lee met its first heavy repulse, and where, as I mentioned before, we saw the national cemetery where 11,000 corpses are interred! We were shown over the ground by a volunteer who at the time of the battle had just joined the Northern army, and was so ignorant that he did

not know how to fire his rifle! We made a long drive through the beautiful scenery of Pennsylvania, where you find an old settled population with pretty farm houses and well-cultivated farms, like those of the old countries of Europe. Over most of America the culture is so rough and the fields so full of stumps and undergrowth that to our eyes there is little beauty. The one consideration with the American farmer is to save the labour bill and get the maximum profit out of the crop, and he prefers rapidly using up the soil, and then going elsewhere, to fertilizing and improving it. I do not remember seeing anywhere except in Pennsylvania a farming district neatly and carefully cultivated.

But what struck me most on this visit was the wonderful recovery of the country after the awful waste of the Civil War. Over a million of soldiers were disbanded (on the two sides) when the war came to an end, and all that vast array was absorbed without difficulty into the industrial life. The finance of the country, which had been in a state of such confusion as almost to threaten national bankruptcy, was getting rapidly into order. The paper dollar, which was an enforced currency for some years, and at one time stood at a discount of sixty to seventy per cent., was just returning to par, and not very long after was made convertible into specie. It was evident to all that the country had passed successfully through the most gigantic struggle of modern times, and the conviction took possession of me that nothing but a miracle could prevent the United States becoming by far the richest, strongest, and most prosperous nation in the world. I was much struck with the great increase of public spirit and patriotism as compared with my visit in 1860, when corruption was rampant; and it was also obvious that the loss of 500,000 men (as proved by Government statistics) by the North and South had wonderfully chastened and sobered the nation, and the vaunting spirit had largely disappeared. Much soreness existed against Great Britain on account of the depredations of the *Alabama* and her consorts, fitted out in this country; and Mr. Gladstone never did a wiser act in his great career than when he left this question to the decision of the Geneva tribunal of Arbitration, which awarded damages of about three millions against this country. Those three millions were worth hundreds of millions to us in removing a standing danger of war with the United States, and in establishing principles of strict neutrality at sea, which we of all countries most require for our world-wide commerce.

I venture to reproduce some reflections on this trip which I penned after my return, limiting them to subjects which have a perennial interest and are almost as true to-day as when they were written :—

I would begin by observing that no impression of the country is so vivid, or leaves so deep a trace upon the mind of a foreigner, as the simple conception of its vastness. It is easy to master the geographical details, and express, in the language of statistics, the area of the country, the volume of its lakes and rivers, etc., but no realizing conception can be formed by the mind, without travelling over a portion of these vast dominions. You spend day after day on fast river steamers or railway trains ; you get wearied with the unceasing flight of half-cleared forest land or broad prairie ; you speed on, week after week, tarrying for brief rest at the new-built cities, but still spending the bulk of your waking hours at the back of the steam engine ; and when you reach your destination, almost giddy with the whirl of perpetual motion, and turn to your map to see what you have accomplished, you notice, with a feeling of dismay, that your weary wanderings have only embraced a corner of the Great Republic ; and you feel ready to exclaim, like the angel who traversed the universe to find the end of creation, " Alas ! there is no end."

* * * * * *

The fervid energy with which the Americans pursue the business of life has no parallel in Europe. The whole nation seems alive with intense eagerness, and the pursuit of wealth is the principal object on which their energy is expended ; it is not, as with us, confined in the main to the trading and manufacturing classes, but permeates the whole body of society ; the ambition to rise in the social scale, or, more properly speaking, to possess more of the material comforts of life, penetrates in America to the lowest stratum of society. The agricultural labourer is seldom to be found who does not aspire to be the owner of a farm, and, unless fortune is very adverse, he generally ends his life a substantial freeholder. The clerk in a store expects and usually comes to be a merchant ; the journeyman printer the editor of a newspaper ; the village attorney, if he so aspire, a member of the legislature, and the New York publican a city alderman !

The rule in America is to rise in the social scale, the exception to remain stationary ; the most prominent men, whether in business or public life, have sprung in most cases from what in this country we would call the lower strata of society ; and so much is this taken as a matter of course, that no one seems to think it at all remarkable that the present President of the United States (Andrew Johnson) was once a journeyman tailor, or the previous one (Lincoln) a rail splitter, nor yet that the richest citizen in New York was once a penniless immigrant from Ireland.

* * * * * *

In connexion with this it is worthy of mention that the Americans

are an exceedingly inventive people. Much of their national prosperity is attributable to the fact that they have utilized the mechanical forces of nature to an extent never known before. A large part of the most energetic talent of the nation is employed in discovering and perfecting useful inventions, and nowhere else is the right of patent so largely claimed or so highly valued. Many of the largest fortunes of America are the fruit of successful patents, and every year vast numbers of fresh patents are taken out. It is an important part of the national policy to encourage inventive genius, and hence the patent laws are admirably administered, and form one of the principal departments of the government. The great wealth of the Northern States is in no small degree owing to the mechanical genius of the people, for their wonderful contrivances to economize labour enable their population to produce with a given amount of exertion a greater quantity of useful commodities than can be produced anywhere else.

* * * * * *

It need not surprise any one after this to be informed that affluence and comfort are diffused among the people of the Northern States to an extent unequalled in any part of Europe. Nothing strikes the stranger more than the absence of poverty all over the North. In our late travels, extending over three thousand miles, we do not remember to have noticed a single beggar, and among the native-born Americans it is rare to see any one whose dress betokens penury. Of course, among the crowd of European immigrants who herd in New York and other great cities, wretchedness enough is to be found, but this wretchedness is, properly speaking, of foreign growth, and disappears as soon as they become industrious members of the American Commonwealth.

* * * * * *

As you travel in the railway cars where all ranks mingle—for there is usually but one class of carriages in America—you notice but little difference in the apparel or bearing of the people. Each one addresses his neighbour as a gentleman, and expects to be treated as such; and yet in their railway trains you get as fair a representation of all orders of the community as you do in our triple class of carriages. The fact is, the horny-handed unwashed plebeians who usually occupy our third-class carriages, have no proper representatives in America; their only counterpart is to be found among the foreign-immigrant population, who are the hewers of wood and drawers of water in that country.

* * * * * *

In connexion with the subject of labour it is worthy of remark that no trace of the late Civil War is observable in the industrial condition of the North. Nearly a million of men were disbanded by the Government eighteen months ago, being about one-sixth of the entire able-bodied male population of the North, and yet never was there a glut of labour; as fast as they were released from Government service they found employment in the busy arena of Northern industry, and wherever we travelled the same complaint reached us that labour was scarce and dear. It was a puzzle even to the Americans how that

vast army vanished; but so thoroughly has it disappeared that a stranger travelling through the North would never dream there had been a war, judging merely from the aspect of society. Except in the city of New York, we did not see a company of soldiers, and then only on one occasion, when a review of militia was held. Few things reveal so clearly the wonderful resources of the country and the industrious habits of the people as the sudden absorption of that vast array of armed men into peaceful pursuits.

* * * * * *

But the great prosperity of the Northern Americans is attributable to another cause quite as potent as their industrial energy: that is, the wide diffusion of intelligence; and this again removes us a step backwards to the ground work of that intelligence, namely, the national system of education. The first care of every state, of every town, of every parish is to appropriate sufficient funds to establish schools and provide the means of education, free of charge, for every child in the district. In the large cities these schools are often noble buildings, containing every appliance for the well-being and comfort of the children; and the head masters are men of high intelligence and public spirit. Nothing pleased us more than the discipline of these great institutions. You enter a building in which seven or eight hundred boys are educated, and you pass from floor to floor and witness female teachers presiding over a room full of little urchins, and the most perfect order and decorum prevail. The slightest word of the teacher is respected, and a bright look of intelligence beams on the faces of the children. We passed through one school at Boston, in which seven hundred Irish boys were educated—the children of poor and ignorant immigrants from Ireland—and nothing could exceed their orderly behaviour and thorough discipline. The master informed us that he found them as intelligent and easily controlled as native-born Americans. The safety of American institutions rests, in the main, upon this admirable system of education. The children are there trained to habits of perseverance, vigorous thought and combined action; they are all, rich and poor, placed on the same platform, for private schools for the benefit of the richer classes are not much in favour in America; and this equalization indoctrinates them at the outset of life with democratic notions, and prevents that chafing and fretting in after life which children exclusively reared betray when forced to associate with men of a rougher type.

* * * * * *

Our remarks thus far have been favourable, but truth requires us now to comment upon some features of the national character which are not subjects for praise. The European traveller, who has been accustomed to refined society in the Old World, and to its multiform subjects of mental interest, is impressed rather painfully with the absence of corresponding attractions in American society. He is struck with the air of materialism that reigns everywhere; he hears a never-ending hum of dollars and cents, and social intercourse seems to be saturated with money worship. It is not to be denied that the Americans are

pre-eminently a business nation ; their best talent goes into the counting house, and a millionaire is the man most envied. They are not an avaricious people : they practise generosity on a noble scale. Their donations to philanthropic objects are princely ; but with all this, it is true that there is a hardness about the lines of the national face which betokens a very intimate acquaintance with the ledger. The Americans are sadly deficient in ideality ; there is little poetry in their composition ; their knowledge of art is borrowed from Europe, and their higher literature is poor compared with ours. In all the loftier regions of intellectual life there is poverty in America ; mediocrity is the rule of the country ; their magazines, their newspapers, their works of fiction, their current poetry are wanting in depth and refinement. There are abundant proofs on all sides that the guiding minds of the country are deficient in culture ; of course little else is to be looked for in a new country, and it is easy to exaggerate this defect in the national character. Many English writers have directed attention so exclusively to those defects, that our transatlantic cousins are justly indignant at the caricature presented to the mother country ; they feel that their solid excellencies have been passed over in silence and their superficial faults held up to ridicule.

Moreover, it is to be remembered that America is not wanting in high-bred society and literary refinement ; few cities in the world can rival Boston—that Athens of America. Names like Longfellow, Motley, Channing, Agassiz, Lowell, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Whittier, Emerson, and others would confer celebrity upon any city, and nowhere is to be found more activity of intellect or higher literary polish. The New-England States are the intellectual seed plots of America ; there is a marvellous fecundity in the mental life of these little States ; their religion, their political and social ideas, their literature, their commerce have overflowed North America, colouring the institutions, the polity, the modes of thought of that vast continent.

* * * * * *

We have spoken, up to this point, mainly of the social and industrial characteristics of the American people, and shall now briefly advert to subjects more political in their nature. On the occasion of our former visit to America our review of her political institutions was the reverse of favourable. A somewhat different impression was made upon our mind by this second visit ; and while the first impressions were not quite dispelled, they were sensibly modified. We attribute this to two causes. We believe, in the first place, that a very real and marked improvement has taken place in the working of these institutions in consequence of the late war ; and secondly, our attention was directed more in this second visit to those deeper sources of national prosperity, which are but imperfectly represented in the political institutions of a nation.

There is no doubt that, prior to the great civil war, a frightful degree of corruption prevailed at the seats of government, and, more or less, through all the subordinate departments of political life. Men of virtue and honour had almost deserted the field, disgusted with the base companionship they were thrown into and the sacrifice of inde-

pendence they had to make. The authority of the law was feeble; the justiciary was time-serving and tainted with corruption; and society was infested with knaves and scoundrels, whom no power was strong enough to repress. It really did seem then as though popular government had failed to secure the first necessities of civilized society, order and justice. But the late civil war brought prominently forward that vast reserve of patriotism which always existed in America. The ranks of public life were weeded of the corrupt and unprincipled crew who had fattened on the spoils of office, and men of stern character and unflinching integrity came to the front; the law became vigorous in its action and government was restored to its proper place. Of course it is perfectly true that all through the war corrupt and selfish men humoured the popular impulses to further their own ends, and far too many of them still exist; but it is beyond dispute that a better class of public men was called into activity by the exigencies of the crisis, and the nation awoke to the conviction that it behoved every citizen to take his share in the toils and dangers of the commonwealth.

No careful observer of the Northern people can fail to observe that the great school of politics is educating the masses of the American people as no other agency can do; every citizen there is called to think and act for himself, and is inspired by the sense of dignity that attaches to a share in the government of the nation. Political themes engage the daily thoughts and conversation of every adult American, scarcely excepting the fair sex, and when you reflect how exceedingly complicated are many of the problems arising out of the late war, you will readily perceive how this employment must invigorate the mind and train it to accurate reasoning. The United States differ from all nations in possessing an elaborately-digested "Constitution," being a written instrument of supreme authority, to which all questions are submitted, as to a court of final appeal. The constant habit of arguing all questions on constitutional grounds has given a legal turn to the national mind, and has served in no small degree to fit it for sound reasoning. The exigencies of the late crisis and the anomalous situation of the Southern States have rendered the application of constitutional principles extremely difficult, and have necessitated numerous attempts to amend the constitution. The controversy thus raised travels over the widest fields of political science, and elevates the mind of the nation to a high pitch of thought and argument. Indeed, it is hard to overestimate the educating influence of the popular government of the Northern States; no European system exerts anything like the same influence over the masses, and we must go back to Athens or Republican Rome to find an equally ardent national life. The opponents of democracy forget this; they fix their attention chiefly on the blemishes that appear on the surface, and overlook its invigorating influence on the rank and file of the nation.

* * * * * *

The "reconstruction" of the South, as it is termed, is a problem of extraordinary difficulty. A republican government is attempting, or rather was attempting, to rule half a continent of disaffected citizens

through the instrumentality of democratic institutions; and as it is perfectly evident that the machinery of republican government is only adapted for voluntary consent, it may be imagined in what a dilemma the North is placed, with the Southern States claiming the rights which republican principles forbid them to deny, but which their dread of Southern influence tells them it is dangerous to concede. Two courses, speaking broadly, were open to the North—the first, to receive back the South, unconditionally, to all the privileges of citizenship, trusting that it would repent of its errors and not abuse its privileges; the other, to refuse it participation in the government of the nation till it gave undoubted guarantees of loyalty.

The former course was at one time in high favour, and President Johnson has been and still is its leading exponent; the latter is now the favourite policy of the North, and the present radical congress is its exponent. To us on this side the Atlantic the policy of Thaddeus Stevens and his party appears harsh and revengeful, but it wears a somewhat different aspect when the standpoint is on American soil. You then see plainly the utter want of harmony that still exists between the North and South; you observe that the public utterances of the South show little sign of rapprochement to Northern sentiments, and you feel that if the South could return its favourite representatives to Congress as of yore, the halls of the Capitol would again become the battle ground of sectional hate. You also feel that the South, restored to self-government, would be a somewhat untrusty custodian of the liberated negro, and that, if the pressure of Northern restraint were removed, the African race would be relegated to a state of abject dependence. It is feelings of this kind which have won over the mass of the more educated and thoughtful people of the North to a policy that wears the guise of harshness. They feel that, in the absence of moral accord between the people of the North and the whites of the South, there is no safety in restoring self government to the latter unless they comply with certain conditions, which will deprive them of the power of doing mischief in the future.

These conditions have been embodied in the famous "constitutional amendment," of which we have heard so much during the past twelve months. It represents in a most concise form what the majority of the Northern people believe to be indispensable conditions to the prudent admission of the Southern States to Congress, and generally to their restoration to self-government.

These conditions are four in number, and are as follows:—

1. The confederate debt is to be for ever repudiated, and the federal for ever held sacred.

2. The negro is to be guaranteed all the civil rights appertaining to the white man.

3. In the future adjustment of Southern representation in Congress, the negro is not to count unless he is admitted to the franchise.

4. A category of the leading confederates to be declared ineligible to office, unless admitted by a two-thirds vote of Congress. This category contains all those who formerly held office under the national

government, but afterwards espoused the confederate cause, and is aimed especially at the officers who were educated at West point, and afterwards commanded the Southern armies.

It will be admitted by all that the first three conditions are fair and just, and the only controversy is about the fourth, which has been made to wear an appearance of great harshness ; but when it is borne in mind that the persons thereby excluded from office were the leaders in what the Northern people considered a causeless rebellion, to conquer which they expended three hundred thousand lives, and three thousand millions of dollars, need we wonder that they affix this mild penalty of exclusion from a share in the government ? None of these men, or very few of them, suffered by confiscation or imprisonment after the war ; not one political leader shed his blood on the scaffold ; the most prominent chiefs in the confederacy might travel where they liked in the North without insult ; and the only limitation placed upon their right is that they be incapacitated for a seat in congress, or other national or state office, until a majority of two-thirds of congress is satisfied of their loyalty and willing to admit them.

We think that seldom have conquerors exacted less rigorous conditions of the conquered ; but the Southern States, though vanquished in war, retain their stubborn spirit of independence, and have unanimously refused to pass this proposed constitutional amendment ; and therefore the congress that sits at Washington refuses to concede to them the right of representation. It is to be regretted for their own sakes that the Southern States had not made a virtue of necessity, and accepted the best terms they could get ; for had they done so, the people of the North, by a large majority would have welcomed their representatives back to the national Capitol, and done what they could to heal the breaches created by that dreadful war. But counsels prevailed that savoured of Spartan times. The South spurned rebuke, and chose political extinction rather than the shame of voluntary humiliation. Nor is this much to be wondered at ; the South loved its Lees and Stonewall Jacksons as ancient Scotland revered its Wallace and Bruce, or Holland the Prince of Orange, or Switzerland William Tell. It refuses to take part in what it deems to be an act of censure on its trusted leaders ; and would rather be shorn of political rights than purchase them by what it deems the loss of its honour. This unhappy dilemma is but a necessary consequence of that disastrous civil war ; and while we may lament the estrangement it has produced, we must be slow to pronounce judgment on either side. The chief misfortune of this state of things is that it is giving ascendancy to a more vindictive party in the North, who are only too glad of the excuse offered them to trample out whatever remains of liberty in the South. This extreme party would fain see political rights withheld from the South till its social system was disintegrated and the black population, aided by immigration from the North, made more than a match for the old dominant class.

My home life was devoid of stirring incident for some years

after visiting the United States. The year 1867, as I said before, was a time of strain and anxiety, and was followed by a year of extraordinary prosperity. The price of American cotton rose in a few months from *7d.* to *14d.* per lb. These gigantic fluctuations were among the sequelae of the Civil War. It was long before the industry of the Southern States revived, and the cotton crops were quite below the wants of the world for several years after. But, speaking broadly, the tendency of prices was steadily downwards, though broken by violent reactions like that of 1868. The general trade of Great Britain was very good in the sixties, and up to 1872–73. Our exports rose rapidly in value; employment was good; wages and profits equally advanced, and a buoyant feeling pervaded the country. We did not know then as well as we afterwards did that much of this apparent prosperity was due to monetary causes. The great gold discoveries of Australia and California immensely increased the yield of that metal. The purchasing power of gold diminished, and this was shown by the steady upward movement of prices. The burden of debts and permanent money charges was thereby reduced, and the only sufferers were annuitants, mortgagees, and holders of fixed interest-bearing securities. It may be said that the general effect was to aid the active industrial classes at the expense of the unproductive rent and interest receivers. It was not then known that the remarkable steadiness of the ratio between gold and silver was owing to the bimetallic law of France and the Latin Union; and it was only when that law was suspended in 1873–74 that silver began to decline, and a long period of bad trade and falling prices darkened our commercial firmament. In 1868 England suffered from an extraordinary drought and scorching heat. For three or four months scarcely any rain fell, and the country was as brown and parched as India in the dry season.

I commenced that autumn the custom of making occasional autumn trips to Switzerland and North Italy with my wife and a party of friends. These were times of great enjoyment. We were singularly fortunate in weather. We usually stayed at the mountain hotels, ascending hills up to 10,000 or 11,000 feet, not attempting the higher Alps, and specially affecting the high passes that lead into the Engadine, and those that connect Switzerland and Italy. I have often thought that in all this fair world there is no assembly of beauty or grandeur equal to the Alpine chain and its spurs reaching into the Tyrol and North Italy, with its

glorious lakes, especially Como and Maggiore, Lucerne, Thun and Geneva, and with its snow-clad peaks, its avalanches and glaciers, and mountain torrents. This scenery drew us as a magnet time after time, and did more to recuperate nervous waste than any recreation I have ever enjoyed. Most of my companions on these journeys have since passed into the silent land; some few still remain, and if these lines fall into their hands they will touch tender chords of memory.

Ye ice-falls! ye that from the mountain's brow
Adown enormous ravines slope amain—
Torrents, methinks, that heard a mighty voice,
And stopped at once amid their maddest plunge!
Motionless torrents! Silent cataracts!
Who made you glorious as the gates of Heaven
Beneath the keen full moon? Who bade the sun
Clothe you with rainbows? Who, with living flowers
Of loveliest blue, spread garlands at your feet?
God! let the torrents, like a shout of nations,
Answer! and let the ice plains echo, God!
God! sing, ye meadows—streams, with gladsome voice.
Ye pine groves, with your soft and soul-like sounds!
And they too have a voice, yon piles of snow,
And in their perilous fall shall thunder, God!

(*Coleridge.*)

CHAPTER VIII

The Franco-Prussian War—Religious and Philanthropic Work in Liverpool—The Town Council and Chamber of Commerce—Moody and Sankey

In the summer of 1870 we took a house at Windermere, beautifully situated above the lake, and our remembrance of that summer was specially pleasant. We had many visitors to Hazelthwaite, and the survivors who read these lines will recall our delightful drives through the country of Wordsworth and Southey. I have always had a partiality for the Lake District: it has a beauty peculiarly its own. In the early summer, when the air is scented by flowering shrubs, I know of nothing sweeter in Europe than Windermere, Grasmere, Keswick and Ullswater. It was during our stay there that the Franco-Prussian War burst upon Europe like a bolt out of the blue sky. A terrible panic occurred in the cotton market. It was then apprehended that France would win and prove once more the evil genius of Europe. English opinion, as often happens, was entirely wrong. The strength of the Prussian Army was not suspected, and when the first battles proved that German valour and strategy were superior to French, a rapid recovery from the panic took place. I well remember how strong the feeling was that the war was wantonly provoked by the Emperor Napoleon for dynastic reasons, and what satisfaction there was at the success of Prussia and the South German Confederation. There was then none of that hostile feeling which has since grown up between the two great Protestant and kindred nations of Europe. Our long association with Germany in the common struggle against the first Napoleon had left deep memories of comradeship; and it has been to many of us a deep cause of sorrow that the great Germanic race (chiefly through its own fault) has drifted into acute antagonism with their kindred in these islands. It is true that when France was beaten to the ground and terribly

severe terms were exacted by Bismarck, a considerable feeling of sympathy sprang up for the beaten party. Who can forget the excitement caused by the agonizing siege of Paris, and the provision train sent from London to feed the starving population when the city surrendered? It was a conflict of giants waged at our doors, and the result was a reconstruction of Europe with Germany at the top, and France far down in the scale.

Towards the end of 1870 our son, James Gordon Smith, was born, and a few years after, as he had no companion, we took a boy to bring up with him—son of a deceased China missionary—who became almost a brother of Gordon, but unhappily died in early manhood, after developing much delicacy of constitution.

The early seventies marked an important change in my life. I had hitherto worked in the parish of Wallasey, and especially in the poor village of Seacombe, where for several years we had a rallying point for Christian philanthropy in the Presbyterian mission, which gradually grew into a prosperous church. For several years I alternated with the good missionary, George Brown, in conducting the Sunday evening service, and my wife had a large class of girls, and others of our family were also actively employed. Our friend, Francis Johnston, was a tower of strength to the mission. He is still active in all good works. I recall much happy fellowship with my friend and neighbour, R. A. Eskrigge, now passed away, one of the purest-minded and most cultured men I have known. These years stand out in memory as perhaps the happiest in my life; the evenings mostly spent at home after a hard day's work in town; my wife reading aloud some inspiring biography or history, or that class of literature I was so fond of where theology, philosophy, and archaeology meet, as in the writings of Bunsen and Max Müller. I well remember when a true sense of Oriental antiquity first burst upon England through the translation of the Vedas, and of the tablets of Nineveh and Babylon. A far-distant world seemed to come to life again. It appealed to our historic imagination as the discovery of Uranus and Neptune affected our ideas of the planetary system. My youthful sense of antiquity was bounded by Troy and Tyre and Carthage, and the Rome of Romulus and Remus; but the records of Babylonia and Tel el Amarna made those ancient cities seem almost modern; and now we see at the Museum of Ghizeh the Pharaoh of the Exodus and long races of kings that preceded him! I must confess to a certain feeling of giddiness produced by these

later discoveries. A recent visit to Luxor and Karnak and the tombs of the Pharaohs leaves on the mind a bewildering sense of antiquity. Our perspective is being slowly adjusted to distances both of space and time which our forefathers recked not of, and some of the effects are rather disturbing to conservative minds like my own.

In the early seventies I was gradually drawn into the maelström of Liverpool's religious and philanthropic life, first through the Young Men's Christian Association, of which I became treasurer more than thirty years ago, then through the establishment of the emigration work of Mrs. Birt for Canada, started by my friend, Alexander Balfour, some thirty years ago. Soon after I joined the "Council of Education," formed by my friend, Christopher Bushell, to supplement the work of the School Board, also the committee of the City Mission, and of some of the penitentiaries. About the same time I was elected to the council of the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce, and served for two years (1876–1877) as President, and soon after that I entered the Town Council.

Looking back on that decade, it leaves the impression of incessant strain on heart and mind—the charge of a heavy business by day broken by endless committee meetings of the various societies I was connected with, and frequent night engagements as well, of a philanthropic kind. The strain at last became overpowering and ended in a severe nervous breakdown with distressing attacks of insomnia. I fancy this experience is a common one for persons of a highly-strung temperament. One only finds out from a hard experience what one is able to accomplish, and when to say "thus far and no further." A few words on these various lines of activity may be of interest, especially to Liverpool friends. When I first became associated with the Y.M.C.A. more than thirty years ago, it was a feeble body with very poor premises in Renshaw Street; but under the buoyant inspiration of my dear friend, Alexander Balfour, who joined us soon after, it grew by leaps and bounds, and at last we planned and carried through the erection of the fine premises in Mount Pleasant at a cost of £25,000. Soon after that we acquired the fine gymnasium in Myrtle Street—the largest in Great Britain—and also established a prosperous North End branch in good premises. The handful of youths expanded to some 1,200 or 1,500 young men, and it has been for many years a power for good in Liverpool. I have served first as Treasurer and then as President (after the death of Mr. Balfour, in 1886) to the present time, but the burden of late years

has fallen largely on our admirable chairman, J. Hope Simpson, manager of the Bank of Liverpool, and Alexander Guthrie, our Treasurer. During the building of our premises Mr. Balfour fell seriously ill, and was long incapable of work, and the architect died, leaving us in a tangle of disputed plans, and much of the burden came on my shoulders; but all was arranged at last, and I look back with much satisfaction on this department of labour.

The honour of starting the emigration of destitute orphan children to Canada belongs to Alexander Balfour. He was cognizant of the work done by Miss Macpherson in London, and he introduced her sister, Mrs. Birt, to a few of us in Liverpool. We formed a committee and launched the scheme which has grown and flourished to this day. Its solid result is the rescue of some 4,000 destitute children from the perils of street trading and slum life, and their settlement in happy Canadian homes. The vast bulk of them, we believe ninety-five per cent., have turned out well, and most of them have now melted into the Canadian population and are indistinguishable from it. On no work do I look back with more thorough satisfaction. As I became increasingly familiar with the huge mass of child misery in Liverpool—mainly the product of drunken homes—I came to see that the great problem for the future of our country was to save the children. In these days there prevailed a wide-spread aversion to interfere between parents and children, even in cases of abominable neglect. Cases came continually before us of the death of children caused by dissolute parents forcing them to trade on the streets in all weathers even to midnight, in snow and frost, and yet we could get no legal protection for these unhappy sufferers. I tried to awaken public opinion by speeches and letters to the newspapers, but was looked upon as a visionary, till at last an opportunity occurred of rousing public opinion. My friend, Thomas F. Agnew (now manager of the Bank of England in Liverpool), had visited the United States and brought home the laws of several of the Northern States for the protection of children against cruelty. I mentioned this at a meeting at the Town Hall, and urged the formation of a society to prevent cruelty to children on the American lines. It was at once taken up, and the Society was formed with Mr. Agnew as its first President. Marvellous results followed. The amount of cruelty brought to light shocked the conscience of humanity. We found that we had a horde of barbarians living in the midst of us, hopelessly drunken and dissolute, and more cruel to their

offspring than Patagonian savages. Other towns followed our example, especially the great city of London, under the inspiration of the Rev. Benjamin Waugh, that true friend of children, and the Baroness Burdett-Coutts. It was soon found that the state of the law was disgraceful, and an Act of Parliament was obtained which might be called the Children's Charter. A second Act, still more drastic, followed a few years after, and now a change has taken place in public sentiment and in the treatment of children which may be called a revolution. The Education Act of 1870, which for the first time brought the mass of English children into our elementary schools, powerfully tended in the same direction. It disclosed the shocking fact that half the children of our cities were growing up in heathen ignorance. At least this was the state of things in Liverpool. While Germany, Switzerland, and the United States had possessed a national system of education for half a century, we, who used to boast of leading civilization, were only starting ours. I was asked to stand for the first School Board, but could not find the time. However, I joined the Council of Education in 1874, and served for many years, under my honoured friend, Christopher Bushell, and along with such men as Alexander Balfour, Samuel Rathbone, and Archdeacon Diggle—our indefatigable secretary. We established a system of scholarships to connect the primary with the secondary schools, and so enable the ablest to reach the higher stage of University education. Not a few of our scholars have risen to distinction, and the whole system of elementary education has been wonderfully improved. Year by year we distribute some thousands of medals for regularity and punctuality of attendance; and from being one of the worst-educated cities in the kingdom, Liverpool now stands high on the list. We also arranged an admirable system of Scriptural instruction, with prizes for the best scholars, and the bulk of the schools, both Board and Church of England, compete for these prizes. One thing has been clearly proved: that there is no difficulty in giving a common basis of Biblical instruction which all Protestant children can join in. In hardly any case do the parents make objection, and, except in the case of extreme ritualists, the clergy of all denominations co-operate harmoniously. I have long held that this is the only practicable basis for common religious instruction in Great Britain, and it is all that is needed in the case of young children mostly under thirteen years of age. There is much in Scripture suited for children. Our Lord's parables and miracles, the striking

historical events of the Old Testament, and some of the Psalms for recitation, afford a common ground for all Christian denominations. The distinctive doctrines of the various churches need not be taught at that early age, but it is all important to lodge in the memory that holy example of life and teaching given by our Saviour Christ. I have never been able to assent to the purely secular theory of education. I opposed the Birmingham League and approved Mr. Forster's Act. The only danger to that Act comes from the excessive sacerdotalism of a section of the Anglican clergy. Under colour of religious education some of them seek to use the schools to destroy the principles of the Reformation, and to restore the Roman doctrines of the Mass and the Confessional. These men are imperilling the very principle of religious education. England still believes in Bible teaching to the young, but detests priestcraft, and all that leads to Rome, and the battle of the future will be to retain the Bible in the schools, while excluding priestcraft. The London School Board, under the guidance of Francis Peek, has adopted a system of prizes for Bible knowledge similar to ours in Liverpool, and I had the pleasure, with my friend, the late Mr. Mundella, of seeing the annual gathering at the Crystal Palace—a truly inspiring sight.

Though anticipating a little I am bound to refer to the founding of University College by my late friend, William Rathbone. When he lost his seat in Parliament (temporarily), he threw himself with an enthusiasm that was contagious into the erection of this college, and I had the pleasure of aiding him in the project, and sat on the first council. Little we thought how rapidly the scheme would grow and what magnitude it would attain, and it is only a question of time till Liverpool has a completely-equipped university of its own.

And now I must pause for a while to describe a work distinctly religious, and which in its outcome affected nearly all the good causes of the city of Liverpool, as indeed it did in most of the great cities of the kingdom. I allude to the great religious movement identified with the names of Moody and Sankey. We formed a committee to invite these American evangelists to Liverpool in 1875, and built for them a large wooden structure called the Victoria Hall, seated for 8,000 people. I had the opportunity of helping in this remarkable work, which made a deep impression on the life of Liverpool. It has never been my lot to see vast crowds so deeply moved as those that filled the Victoria Hall

night after night for more than a month. I have often listened to the eloquence of Gladstone, and sometimes of Bright, but neither of these orators could hold 8,000 or 10,000 people night after night spellbound as Mr. Moody did. And, strange to say, he had no graces of eloquence, but had an uncouth manner and an unmusical voice, occasional bad grammar, and not a few Yankee mannerisms. My first impression was decidedly unfavourable; yet before the Mission had lasted a week I was carried away, as every one was, by the magnetic influence of that man of God. By no other name can you truly describe Mr. Moody, and in a less degree Mr. Sankey as well. The evident sincerity, the tremendous earnestness, the wondrous knowledge of the human heart and of God's great remedy for sin, made Moody's appeals irresistible. Behind it all lay great natural shrewdness and a striking originality which in any sphere of life would have brought him to the front. He reminded me in many ways of Abraham Lincoln, that rough home-spun genius. I saw night after night hundreds of the roughest and coarsest characters in Liverpool melted into tears and earnestly seeking the way of life. The lion became a lamb, the drunken became sober, the thief honest, the profligate chaste. At one meeting at the close of the mission 2,500 people avowed publicly their change of heart, and many have stood the test to this day. It is true that when the excitement subsided not a few so-called converts fell away. This always happens: our Lord Himself predicted it. But the general effect in Liverpool was uplifting in a high degree. One could discern in the public life of the city for many years after the impress of a higher tone. Forms of evil that had been winked at by men in authority were boldly attacked, and in a less degree we saw in the two decades following some of the results that in New York have come from the overthrow of Tammany Hall. The fact is that there is no power that will move men to righteousness of life like the faithful preaching of the Gospel. Statesmen may pass good laws, but they will not cure the evils of society without the motive power of personal religion behind them. All who desire true national progress should welcome religious revival, for it is the handmaid of every good cause that makes for human welfare. This great religious movement went on for two years at least after the American evangelists left us, and one of its permanent fruits was the formation of "The British Workman Public House Co." I well remember at a midday conference, when Mr. Moody asked for suggestions for grappling

with the fearful drunkenness of the dock labourers and artisan class generally, it was pointed out that there was no provision for their obtaining food except at the public houses along the docks. One of our best philanthropists, the Rev. Charles Garrett, suggested forming a company to establish coffee or tea rooms, with solid food as well, and it was immediately taken up with enthusiasm. Capital was at once subscribed sufficient for a start. Some of us formed a committee and launched the company, under the valuable chairmanship of Robert Lockhart, which supplied a most obvious necessity. Our houses kept increasing until we had about eighty scattered over the town, including superior cafés for merchants and clerks. For workmen we gave a large cup of tea or coffee at a penny, and before long we supplied some 20,000 meals daily, and have for several years taken some £80,000 annually for temperance refreshments. From Liverpool the movement spread all over England and Scotland, and nothing has done more to make temperance easy among the working classes.

I may add, in closing this reference to Mr. Moody, that I heard him several times in America during my last two visits—the last time in Boston, in 1899, shortly before his death. He still gathered great crowds and preached the same Gospel in the same way, but it seemed to me that there was less power, which I attribute to the fact that his ideas and modes of expression were so well known from incessant reporting that they had lost their freshness, and his mind had ceased to form new material. This is the almost universal experience of men who are constantly addressing the public, over a life-time. No genius or originality can stand the strain of being reported almost daily for thirty or forty years. The drain on the mental energies is terrific, and sooner or later wears out the brain, or reduces it to an echo of the past. In no other respect could I detect a change in D. L. Moody. He has left in America an unblemished name which will go down to future ages as a companion to Wesley and Whitefield. It may interest my readers to hear that I spent part of an evening with him in Boston shortly before he died, and he was speaking with deep sorrow of the South African War. He was a true friend of Great Britain, and was greatly distressed at the unhappy contest between kindred Protestant races, who ought to have been friends and co-workers for humanity.

CHAPTER IX

"Conditional Immortality"—"The Credibility of the Christian Religion"

I MUST now advert to a subject of great delicacy, which truth alone compels me to speak of. I hesitated for a time to disclose the line I took on a controversy that burst on the religious world during the seventies. I am aware that the line I adopted was obnoxious to some of my friends, and it was with great pain that I found myself obliged to avow a change of opinion on one of the doctrines commonly held by all classes of Christians, especially the Evangelical section, to which I have always belonged.

It will be in the recollection of middle-aged persons that there suddenly broke over the country, about twenty-five years ago, a controversy on the subject of "eternal punishment." Up to then it had been accepted or acquiesced in by nearly all orthodox believers, and existed in nearly all modern as well as ancient creeds. But the pressure of the awful doctrine had been felt by many of us as almost unendurable. In the minds of many thoughtful Christians its contrast with the goodness of God whose name is Love, was felt to be inexplicable; and when added to another doctrine, chiefly held by evangelicals, that salvation was only possible to the limited number of true believers in Christ—a mere fraction of the world's population—the mystery became insoluble.

I had for years felt the terrible difficulty of this problem, but I could see no solution. Scripture seemed dead against any restoration of the wicked after the Day of Judgment. The finality of their doom was only too obvious; and yet deep down in the human heart was a protest against this awful dogma. I felt increasingly that there was "something wrong somewhere," but could get no further, till an event happened that let a chink of light into my soul. I noticed a discussion reported in the papers

on the subject of "The Immortality of the Soul," and was startled by the statement that the Scriptures did not teach that doctrine. It had never occurred to me to doubt it. I did not know a living Christian who doubted it. I supposed it was a corner stone of the Christian religion, and that without it the fabric would collapse. I was a Platonist: proud of the Platonic philosophy, which I regarded as in some respects a protevangelion—a preparation for the Gospel. I felt an impelling necessity to examine the Scriptures afresh on that subject. It was clear to me that the doctrine of everlasting sin and misery was bound up with the doctrine of man's immortality. The only reason that could be given why a God of Love should keep alive a multitude of sinning and suffering human beings through all eternity was that they, being immortal, He could not extinguish their being. If the one doctrine were not true, the other would fall to the ground.

For a considerable time I studied the Scriptures on this point, reading, according to my custom, the Greek original of the New Testament; and it became more and more clear to me that the immortality of the soul was unknown to the writers of the New Testament. I could not find a trace of it, and my astonishment was great. I also saw plainly that if that doctrine were removed there was nothing to prevent the central truth of St. Paul from being taken in its plain literal sense. "The wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord." By what I can only call a wonderful Providence my attention was drawn to a book entitled *Life in Christ*, by Rev. Edward White. I ordered it and read it with intense interest. No book ever wrought such a change in my opinions. I there found every difficulty that had puzzled me, fully, fairly, and honestly dealt with. I found a combination of learning, piety, and original research which deeply impressed me; and when I finished the book the fair edifice of eternal life in Christ rose up like "the Palace Beautiful" to the hardly-bestead pilgrims. The argument seemed to me conclusive. I had been a great reader of theology, but had never met so sustained and powerful an argument, and its chief merit was that it rivetted with chains of adamant the foundation truths of the Deity, and Atonement of Christ, and the glad offer of salvation to a dying race. So far from weakening the orthodox faith, it greatly strengthened it by removing a false admixture of human philosophy. It is true that Platonism was a good thing before the Christian religion; it was the best solution

that a non-Christian man could attain; but it is like a rush-light to the sun when compared with the full-orbed Gospel; and, as often happens, two good but antagonistic systems when amalgamated make a noxious mixture.

I have read *Life in Christ* four times over with great care. I admit that there are difficulties which it does not fully solve. No book ever written will fully solve them, for it deals with the whole realm of eschatology, by far the most difficult part of Divine revelation. No careful student of Scripture can avoid seeing that a certain veil is drawn over parts of this mysterious subject. Even the inspired Apostles vary within moderate compass, and use language that is capable of being interpreted in various ways. On the awful subject of future punishment dark and mysterious language is used, rather shadowing forth than describing the fate of the impenitent.

Some principles are clearly enunciated. Death is not the end: "after death the judgment." All mankind must appear before God to receive "the due reward of their deeds." The wicked and the wilful transgressors have an awful fate before them, "weeping, wailing, and gnashing of teeth," leading up to eternal destruction of body and soul in the "second death." From this I draw the strong hope that literally and truly "God will be all in all," and that there will be "new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness."

I cannot conceive a more powerful or more impressive message to deliver to men, and I believe its full reception will reanimate the decayed faith in the Christian revelation which has been too evident of late years.

I wrote the following letter to Mr. White, in 1876, after reading his book:—

CARLETON, PRINCES PARK, LIVERPOOL:
May 3, 1876.

Rev. E. White.

DEAR SIR,

I wish to say to you how deeply interested I have been in reading your book entitled *Life in Christ*. It has sent a thrill through my whole nature, and stirred me in a way no book has done for many years.

The reason of this is that I have been for many years deeply exercised about the destiny of mankind, and at times have felt awfully afflicted by the thought of the orthodox doctrine concerning the unsaved.

A firm believer myself in the Lord Jesus, and never doubting my

own salvation since my conversion, a good many years ago, I felt that I could not have peace and joy while the bulk of mankind were exposed to *endless* torment, nor could I reconcile it with the character of God as delineated in Scripture, and as revealed in the person of His Son.

For several years I have only half believed the doctrine, though unable to see clearly on scriptural grounds how I could escape from receiving it. I had been taught to accept, as a matter of course, the doctrine of the soul's immortality, and as the Scriptures negative the idea of the ultimate recovery of the unsaved, there seemed no alternative but the orthodox view. It was a year or two ago that the idea of the soul's *conditional* immortality was first suggested to me from a public discussion in the neighbourhood (nr. Birkenhead). It flashed across my mind like a light from above, and I have since been reading the Bible with this thought before me, testing it by the Word of God. Your book came into my hands just as my mind was open to receive it, and it presented a coherent view of the whole matter which has impressed me most forcibly with its truthfulness ; indeed, the arguments from Scripture seem to me conclusive.

The difficulty with me, as it must be with many, is that your view is so new to most Christians, and is looked upon as so dangerous and delusive by most leaders of the Christian Church, that one feels staggered and almost unable to resist the powerful influence brought to bear upon them. Indeed, I feel that to me it would be a kind of martyrdom to avow such opinions, for I am deeply interested in religious work in this town, and identified with many evangelical associations, and in daily contact with earnest and influential Christians, nearly all of whom, I suppose, would look upon a lapse to your views as a heresy that would disqualify for religious work. Consequently, I might be shut out from working for the Lord Jesus, in great measure, which is the great end of my life, and the thought of this is very painful to me. Still I feel I could cheerfully endure all this were I *perfectly certain* that your views are true, and that God is with us, but I have not yet reached this full assurance. If I do reach it I would feel it my duty to avow it, for what has been so great a relief to my mind should not be concealed from others.

I would much like to meet with you, and converse more fully regarding these things. Should you be in my neighbourhood I would be delighted to see you, or if agreeable I might call upon you some time in London. Meanwhile I will write to your publisher to send me several copies of your book for circulation among my friends.

Believe me, dear sir,

Yours very truly,

(Signed) SAMUEL SMITH.

After pondering the subject for nearly twenty-five years I wrote the following letter to Professor Agar Beet, whose book on *The Last Things* opened this question to the great Wesleyan body :—

and read them first with these words in their ordinary sense, and then substitute for them the secondary sense of spiritual life, spiritual death, and so on, and you will find that the first way of reading is good sense, and the second way is nonsense. We are constantly told in Scripture that Christ died or suffered death, but there is no hint that the words change their sense when applied to mankind, only in the case of the ungodly the first death leads to the awful doom of the second death, which is eternal. The words of Christ are: "All that are in the graves shall hear His voice and shall come forth, they that have done good into the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil into the resurrection of judgment" (John v. 28, 29).

Doubtless you are right in stating that no ray of hope is held out to those who wilfully reject Christ, but there is hope for those who have lived up to the light of conscience, and have not known Christ in this life. One feels with regard to them that God has not revealed everything to us. Indeed, as one gets older, they feel increasingly that we only get light enough for our duty, but not enough to answer speculative questions. One comes to see that there is much partial revelation—"Now we see through a glass darkly." One increasingly trusts the goodness of God to do right at last, and one shrinks from the hard and arbitrary way that some speak about the necessity of the Divine dealings.

One thing grows upon me: God's work will not be a failure. At some time and in some way there will be an immense overplus of good. "God will be all in all." "All things will be subdued unto Him." "He must reign till He hath put all enemies under His feet." "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." These words mean a complete triumph at some time: they are not consistent with the everlasting sin and misery of a countless number of our fellow-creatures. We may not be able to solve this riddle now, but we can trust our Blessed Lord to solve it in some way far higher than we can think of. I agree with you that the moral sense of man, especially its sanctified form in a spiritual man, is not to be set aside in judging of the Divine action. God constantly appeals to it. He cannot act so as to shock its sense of justice. Our moral sense cries out against hopeless, endless, ceaseless misery. God has Himself implanted this feeling in our nature, yet He has also implanted a deep sense of the evil of sin and the necessity of its punishment. Between these two poles the true centre of Divine justice lies.

On the whole, the view put forth in Edward White's *Life in Christ*, commends itself to my judgment, though I allow that some sections of the book are not altogether satisfying; but probably no theory will ever be forthcoming which will remove all difficulties, until the Lord comes. You have done great service in opening up to the great Wesleyan body this need of reconstructing their eschatology. Wesley did great service in modifying the harsh Calvinism of his day. For that he was counted a heretic by many. It is the penalty for each advance of truth that the pioneer is a heretic in his life-time, but is canonised after his death. Wesley was wholly wrong about the immortality of the soul,

and bequeathed that error to burden the Methodist churches to-day, as Calvin burdened his countless followers with the awful doctrine of unconditional reprobation. It seems to take centuries to get rid of the errors of Church leaders, and the attempt to do so often rends the Churches.

We should be very patient with these inevitable changes. They need to come slowly, so as not to disturb weak consciences, yet they must come sooner or later, or the stronger intellects drift into unbelief. God seems gradually to train the race to higher and juster views of Himself, and He is patient with provisional views which suit the immature conscience of humanity.

Excuse these lines written after perusing your truly able and earnest work,

And believe me, with much respect,
Yours very truly,
(Signed) SAMUEL SMITH.

It is well known that Mr. Gladstone died practically holding this doctrine. I quote from his book on Bishop Butler :—

Another consideration of the highest importance is that the natural immortality of the soul is a doctrine wholly unknown to the Holy Scriptures, and standing on no higher plane than that of an ingeniously sustained, but gravely and formidably contested, philosophical opinion. And surely there is nothing as to which we ought to be more on our guard, than the entrance into the precinct of Christian doctrine, either without authority or by the abuse of authority, of philosophical speculation, disguised as truths of Divine Revelation. They bring with them a grave restraint on mental liberty ; but what is worse is, that their basis is a pretension essentially false, and productive by rational retribution of other falsehoods. Under these two heads we may perhaps find that we have ample warrant for declining to accept the tenet of natural immortality as a truth of Divine Revelation. (W. E. Gladstone's *Studies Subservient to the Works of Bishop Butler*, p. 197.)

The secret of this mental freedom, the condition which made it possible, was the absence from the scene of any doctrine of a natural immortality inherent to the soul. Absent it may be termed, for all practical purposes, until the third century ; for though it was taught by Tertullian in connexion with the Platonic ideas, it was not given forth as belonging to the doctrine of Christ or His Apostles. . . . It seems to me as if it were from the time of Origen that we are to regard the idea of natural, as opposed to that of Christian, immortality as beginning to gain a firm foothold in the Christian Church. (*Ibid.*, p. 184.)

Also from Bishop Gore :—

Careful attention to the origin of the doctrine of the necessary

immortality or indestructibility of each human soul, as stated, for instance, by Augustine or Aquinas, will probably convince us that it was no part of the original Christian message, or of really Catholic doctrine. It was rather a speculation of Platonism taking possession of the Church. And this consideration leaves open possibilities of the ultimate extinction of personal consciousness in the lost, which Augustinianism somewhat rudely closed. (Bishop Gore: *The Epistle to the Romans*, vol. ii. p. 212.)

And it is well known that the late Dr. Dale held the same view, as also the great missioner, William Hay Aitken, and a multitude of pious and learned men, such as Archbishop Whately. My friendship with Edward White continued to the end of his life in 1898. He was a man of rare genius and force of character, bearing the impress of marked individuality which belongs to all true leaders of men. I believe that hardly any book in modern times has affected so much the higher ranges of religious thought as his *Life in Christ*. I may add that for several years I read and studied this question more than any other. Indeed, I cannot conceive how any man worthy of the name can fail to see how the problem of the future life is incomparably the greatest. As our great dramatist says:—

> To be or not to be, that is the question,
> Whether 'tis nobler in the mind to suffer
> The slings and arrows of outrageous fortune,
> Or to take arms against a sea of troubles,
> And, by opposing, end them? To die, to sleep:
> No more: and by a sleep to say we end
> The heartache and the thousand natural shocks
> That flesh is heir to—'tis a consummation
> Devoutly to be wished. To die, to sleep:
> To sleep, perchance to dream: Ay, there's the rub!
> For in that sleep of death what dreams may come
> When we have shuffled off this mortal coil
> Must give us pause. . : :

When faith in a future life dies out, all that is good goes down with it, and in this age of materialism it seems to me all important to plant on an impregnable foundation a theodicy which approves itself to the moral sense of man.

This leads me to say that we are encountering the most strenuous attempt to undermine supernatural religion that has been witnessed for many years. A multitude of writers under guise of fiction are instilling infidel ideas into millions of readers; a large section

of journalism and magazine literature is at bottom adverse to the authority of Christ. All civilized countries witness the same phenomenon. One cannot help seeing that a far smaller proportion of men attend the worship of God than was formerly the case; and no one can tell how far false and one-sided representations of the Divine character in former ages are responsible for this.

In the early seventies I felt, as most thinking men did, the impact of the stream of unbelief which came from France and Germany in the train of Renan and Strauss. The Tübingen school had popularized in Germany the mythical theory of the Gospels. It was taught by a multitude of professors that the Gospels were the product of the second century, and based upon fabulous legends which had gathered round the central figure of Jesus of Nazareth. Though this absurd theory is now utterly exploded, and no scholar of eminence upholds it, it had for a time a deadly effect both in Germany and England. I found it largely spread among young men, and felt impelled to grapple with it as far as I could. I delivered two lectures in Hope Hall in 1871, and these were expanded into a small volume published by Hodder and Stoughton in 1872, entitled, *The Credibility of the Christian Religion.*

I tried to show, on the principles of Butler, that the evidence of Christianity was on the lines of "the constitution and course of nature," and was as clear and convincing as that which we receive and act upon in the ordinary work of life, and that these wild mythical theories would utterly break down if applied to the common affairs of life. At the same time I had to admit that the faults of Christian teachers had something to do with modern repugnance to receive the supernatural, especially the insistence on infallibility in the definition of doctrine even to the most minute particulars. I pointed out that some theologians claimed for the Bible what it never claimed for itself, viz., that it was an absolutely logical and inerrant statement of every kind of truth that touched upon religion, that nothing was left in shade or partially defined, but that it was all, like the Athanasian Creed, sharply thrown into propositions which had to be received *literatim et verbatim* on the penalty of eternal damnation.

Few hold more strongly than I the thorough truthfulness and trustworthiness of the Word of God; few seek to found their belief more on its teaching; yet I have long seen that it is not a book of mathematics, and that its subject matter does not admit of perfect exactness of definition. It employs all the resources of

human language—poetry, figure, allegory, symbol, and parable, as well as doctrinal definition, to set forth its many-sided truth, and it was never intended, nor is it humanly possible, to force into one rigid mould all the types of Christian opinion. This I hold, while equally convinced that there is a Divine unity of Scripture, and a convergence of all the rays of light on the central focus of Jesus Christ and Him crucified. The storm centre has now changed. The labours of Lightfoot and Hort have planted the historicity of the New Testament on an impregnable basis, but the modern school of rationalists are trying to pulverize Old Testament history. Some of them see plainly that if they succeed in overthrowing the historicity of the Pentateuch, the authority of Christ falls along with it, for He undoubtedly believed and taught the Hebrew Old Testament. "Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed Me, for he spake of Me; but if ye believe not his sayings, how can ye believe My words?" I avow my conviction that this attack will fail, like that on the New Testament: I mean that riper scholarship will prove the reliability of the old Hebrew History; but meanwhile the faith of many is weakened in Divine Revelation. At bottom the repugnance to believe the Christian revelation is too often a repugnance to a life of holiness and self-denial. Men draw their convictions from a great depth. They too often display a fatal bias against the truth, and argument alone will never convince mere gainsayers.

NOTE

His feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. . . . And when all things shall be subdued unto Him, then shall the Son also Himself be subject unto Him that put all things under Him, that God may be all in all" (1 Cor. xv. 25–28).

I may add, in conclusion, that the single expression, "These shall go away into eternal punishment" (R.V.), which is only once used in the Bible, is made to overrule the hundreds of passages in which "death," "destruction," and "perishing" are described as the doom of the wicked. Is it not more reasonable to suppose that this single passage means "eternal destruction" as stated in 2 Thessalonians i. 9? Because the final and eternal withdrawal of life from a creature that might have lived for ever in a glorious immortality is surely an "eternal punishment."

CHAPTER X

We come to "Carleton"—Work at the Coliseum—The Temperance Movement in Liverpool

I HAVE drifted a little from chronological order in piecing together religious events, and have omitted to notice our change of abode in 1875. Increasing engagements in Liverpool made residence in Cheshire inconvenient, and at last, with great reluctance, we gave up our sweet home—Woodlands, Liscard Vale—and came over to Carleton, Prince's Park. It was a sore wrench, for delightful associations had gathered round that peaceful home: the happiest time of my life was spent there: and once embarked on the tempestuous ocean of Liverpool life there was little more rest for body or mind. One delightful engagement was found possible at Carleton. We formed a "Clerical Club," which met there in the winter months once every three weeks. It included most of the Presbyterian ministers of Liverpool and neighbourhood, and some other friends. We took tea together, and then for two hours discussed some theological subject, one of our party opening by a short paper. Our object was edification, not argumentation, and we succeeded in keeping up this character for several years. Even after I entered Parliament we continued, with fewer meetings, and only finally closed our sittings two or three years ago. Most of our earlier members have passed away, and one feels impoverished by the loss of such men as Dr. Lundie, Dr. Symington, Dr. William Graham, James Towers, J. J. Muir (my special friend), and others, who "served their own generation by the will of God." These lines of Shairp often recur to me:—

SAINTS DEPARTED.

While they here sojourn'd, their presence drew us
By the sweetness of their human love;
Day by day good thoughts of them renew us,
Like fresh tidings from the world above.

Coming, like the stars at gloamin', glinting
  Through the western clouds, when loud winds cease,
Silently of that calm country hinting,
  Where they with the angels are at peace.

Not their own, ah! not from earth was flowing
  That high strain to which their souls were tuned;
Year by year we saw them inly growing
  Liker Him with whom their hearts communed.

Then to Him they pass'd; but still unbroken,
  Age to age, lasts on that goodly line,
Whose pure lives are, more than all words spoken,
  Earth's best witness to the life divine.

(*John Campbell Shairp.*)

Another very interesting development of religious work occurred in this way. An old theatre, the Coliseum, in Paradise Street, was closed up as the result of an accident in which thirty or forty people were trodden to death. We had an eccentric temperance reformer called William Simpson, who had charge of the landing-stage. I had been much impressed with the need of providing wholesome amusements for the poor, on temperance lines, so as to wean them from the public houses, where a great part of their earnings were spent. I offered to take the theatre for a year, and place it at the disposal of Simpson, to organize innocent amusements at a low charge. The experiment was tried for a year, but was not very successful, and involved considerable loss. So it was given up; but another and far more successful attempt was made, which I will now describe.

It was decided to use the theatre for Sunday evening services, and try to gather in the degraded population around it. This was attained by giving a roll or small loaf of bread to each person who attended. This may be called a species of bribery, but we argued that a piece of dry bread could only be acceptable to a hungry man, and our object was to get at the lowest stratum of the population. We succeeded to our hearts' content, for we had the place crammed each Sunday; and so many children came in with their parents, especially squalling babies in their mothers' arms, that the noise was like that of Pandemonium. At last we were obliged to separate the children and form a special meeting for them. We utilized a large room at the top of the building, which held 1,000 children, and we soon filled it, and secured a devoted class of teachers and an able superintendent, and from that day

to this—some twenty or twenty-five years—the school has flourished. It has long been removed from this upper room, with its dangerous steep stair, to a ground floor, but it is still called the Coliseum Sunday School, and gathers about 1,000 of the poorest children of the city; and some sixty teachers, many of them hard workers in shops all the week, faithfully attend, not merely on Sunday, but on several nights of the week, when classes of all kinds are carried on for gymnastics, ambulance, sewing, etc., and even their wounds are attended to by a doctor.

When we began our work the condition of the children was deplorable. Indeed, the whole company, young and old, almost literally fulfilled the words of Isaiah: "from the crown of the head to the sole of the foot there was no soundness in them, but wounds and bruises and putrefying sores." The filth and stench of the audience were indescribable. One could hardly walk through to the platform without feeling sick. Those were the days when public baths for the poor were almost unknown, or at least unused, and when a large part of the poor population lived in enclosed "courts" or "closes," with no ventilation and no lighting at night. The women sat on the doorsteps gossiping or quarrelling with their neighbours most of the day, and the men spent half their wages in the public house, which sucked the life out of the people. After some years we moved the adult meeting to the Picton Lecture Hall, where it has been held for many years. Often have I seen it crowded to suffocation with 1,200 or 1,400 people, and we had to limit the number at last to avoid risk of accidents. During that long period we never had an accident or trouble of any serious kind, though we had the *débris* of our social system, men and women who had drunk themselves to rags, and whose very breath was poisonous. Each night we took temperance pledges from all who voluntarily offered, and employed visitors to follow them up as far as possible. I fancy since we began this work we must have taken little short of 15,000 or 20,000 pledges. No doubt the great bulk were not kept, but many hundreds of people have been entirely changed. From being little better than brute beasts they have regained self control and decency of life. The Gospel still proves itself "the power of God unto salvation to every one who believeth."

In the earlier stages of the movement my friend, Alexander Simmonds, divided with me the management, and we took the Sunday service alternately. When he went to London I found

an efficient helper in Edward Boreland, and a staff of earnest voluntary workers. Failing health will, I fear, not permit much more personal supervision, but this work still goes on.

Looking back on Liverpool in those days, it may very truly be said that the drink trade was the curse of the town. The squalor of the lower parts was indescribable. Some classes of labourers, and even of the higher artisans like ship carpenters and boiler makers, were excessively drunken, and the higher the wages the more wretched the home. I knew of cases of men with 50s. or 60s. per week who had hardly a stick of furniture in their houses, and whose children were in rags. One of the commonest tricks was to send out little children on snowy nights, half naked, to solicit alms. I have often seen small boys and girls with unsold bundles of papers asleep on doorsteps near midnight. When you awakened them and asked them to go home they began to cry, as they would be beaten if they returned without their stock being sold off. Gradually this state of things was altered by prosecutions for neglect by the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children. Now we have excellent bye-laws of the Town Council to regulate street trading, which makes this impossible; also an excellent system of clothing ragged children, inaugurated by the then Mayor, Mr. Watts. In the seventies, and after I entered the Town Council, I made many attempts to get supervision of street children, but the time was not ripe. The usual reply was: "Surely you would not interfere between a parent and his children!"

As Ephesus was said to be a worshipper of the great goddess Diana, it might be said that Liverpool was a worshipper of the great goddess Beer. It had so entrenched itself in the Town Council and among the magistracy by allying itself with politics, that it was almost impossible to get any real supervision of the public house. Both political parties had made huge mistakes. Some years before, the Liberals, following the lead of Robertson Gladstone, in order to get rid of the monopoly, adopted the system of free licensing. This practically meant that every one who asked for a license obtained it unless specially disqualified. The effect was to flood the town with drink and to greatly increase drunkenness. When too late it was seen that vast mischief was done, but then the opposite policy was adopted of regarding a license as a vested right which could never be taken away except for some outrageous abuse. The Tory party at the time was so closely allied with the drink interest (though many among them detested

it) that they would do nothing to touch the value of licenses. In one year 19,000 cases of drunkenness were reported by the police, and only three publicans prosecuted. The Watch Committee of the Town Council, which controlled the police, was long dominated by the drink trade, and the grossest abuses were allowed to go on unchecked. The friends of temperance, like Alexander Balfour and Dr. Lundie, were snubbed when they pleaded for the strict execution of the law. It was about that time that my friend, Alexander Balfour, went into the Town Council to combat this evil. He was for a long time like John the Baptist, crying in the wilderness, and his friend and ally, the late Dr. Lundie, year after year attended the licensing sessions to expose the shocking abuses that went on unchecked in what the late John Patterson called "the drunkeries of Liverpool." *Magna est veritas et praevalebit*": sooner or later the truth tells. As an old author says: "Testify, testify, testify." The walls of Jericho fell at last under repeated blowing of rams' horns; and Liverpool in the eighties and nineties saw a wonderful change for the better under the higher spirit that took possession of the city. Though anticipating a little, I may say that we owe much to Sir Thomas Hughes, who for several years has most faithfully presided at the licensing sessions, and was, I think, the first to insist that children under thirteen years of age should not be served at public houses—the legislature has now made it fourteen, though with some regrettable exceptions. But the real pioneers, the men who bore the burden and heat of the day, were Alexander Balfour and the Rev. R. H. Lundie—two names that will long live in the grateful remembrance of Liverpool.

In closing this section of my life in the seventies it seems to me in retrospect as though I had been immersed in a sea of human misery. I came into contact with such crowds of squalid sunken creatures that it had a very depressing effect, and possibly made me speak with some acerbity of our social system. It wholly delivered me from vain-glorious boastings of our national greatness, and made me impatient of the constant harping of our politicians on our expanding trade and our growing wealth, and ascribing all our growth to the sovereign panacea of Free Trade. Indeed, in those days the term "Free Trade" was a shibboleth which men worshipped with little more intelligence than the Ephesians did "the image that fell down from Jupiter." It imposed almost insuperable difficulties on putting restraints on the abuse of

liberty. "Would you interfere with 'freedom of contract?'" was an answer to every suggestion to protect the weak and helpless. Everything was called Socialism which proposed to limit the rapacity and greed of the vilest traders in human corruption. *Corruptio optimi pessima est.* The very liberty that England had obtained by ages of struggle had become a positive obstacle to wise and paternal government. It was in that frame of mind that I entered Parliament a few years later.

CHAPTER XI

Death of my Father and Sister—The Chamber of Commerce and the Silver Question

I MAY mention at this point that the first break in our family life occurred in 1876. My venerable father was taken from us at the age of 87. Up till a year or two before his death he had good health and the full use of his faculties, and our frequent visits to the paternal home were a source of the truest pleasure. My father's memory will long be cherished as that of the kindest of parents, and one who might have sat for Horace's portrait: "Integer vitae scelerisque purus." Any success in life that attended his family was largely due to his example. He was the embodiment of "mens sana in corpore sano," a man of sound judgment and sterling principle, whose word was as good as his bond, and whose view of life was governed by the ever-present sense of his accountability to God. For forty years there had not been a breach in our family of nine. I had hardly known bereavement; but since then the blows of adversity have come fast and furious, and seldom have I been out of mourning. That same year saw the death of my youngest sister Agnes at Pau, in France, of consumption—a lovely girl of beautiful character. Few years have passed since then without the death of some one of the home circle or of my intimate friends.

I now turn for a little to a subject that engrossed much of my time for several years. I entered the Council of the Chamber of Commerce in the early seventies, and served as President in 1876–77. I shrank from the position, as I was already on a dozen committees, but fortunately I had a quieter time than most of my successors. In those days the work of the chamber was chiefly done by a small group of able and active men, including John Patterson, Charles Clarke, E. Muspratt, William Forwood (now Sir William), and Philip Rathbone. The early death of Charles Clarke I felt very much. He was one of the most brilliant men I encountered in my early life. To great natural eloquence he added indomitable

legislation could fix a ratio between gold and silver any more than between cotton and wool. But I was convinced by the brilliant demonstrations of Cernuschi when I was President of the Chamber in 1876, as also were my friends, Stephen Williamson and John Patterson, and we formed a school of opinion in Liverpool which afterwards spread to Manchester.

Mr. Williamson published an able pamphlet on the subject in 1876, and I followed with another in the same year. Thereafter I published a number of addresses which I delivered throughout the country in subsequent years, and devoted a vast amount of time and labour to this most difficult question. After I entered Parliament I raised this question again and again. Indeed, hardly any of my public work made heavier demands on my strength. None of us fully estimated at the time the tremendous force of the prejudice we had to encounter. The British character has great solidity and a kind of *vis inertiae* which serves it admirably in times of stress, but it sadly lacks imagination, and can hardly be got to change its view point, even when it is demonstrated to be entirely mistaken.

The gold standard was first instituted by England on resuming specie payments after the Napoleonic wars. It added greatly to the burden of the huge National Debt, which had been borrowed either in bimetallic money (the old system) or in depreciated paper currency. Those sufferings were endured in that dreary period between 1815 and 1850, when a great part of the population was half starved, and it was the bounty of nature, not the wisdom of legislators, which lightened the intolerable burden in 1850–73. What then caused the reverse movement which largely paralysed the national prosperity? It was without doubt the demonetization of silver over a large part of the world and the struggle to fill the place with gold at a time when the supply of gold greatly fell off. France, after the Franco-German war, decided to suspend her silver coinage. She was followed by the other States of the Latin Union. Germany demonetized her large silver currency and adopted a gold standard. The United States resumed specie payments in gold, instead of her old bimetallic system, and had to collect an immense sum of gold for several years prior to this step. Then several smaller countries followed suit, with the result that the scramble for the coveted metal greatly appreciated its value—in other words, caused a heavy fall in general prices. The best proof of that is shown by the fact that British exports in 1873

reached 255 millions and fell in 1885 to 212 millions, though if valued at the prices ruling in 1873 the amount would have been 350 millions. In other words, the fall of prices was fully forty per cent., bringing them as low as in 1849. Considering that the fixed charges of the country (public and private) are paid mainly by the sale of commodities, the burdens on the productive classes were really increased by at least fifty millions a year—probably much more.

We suffered indeed from a twofold evil in those depressed times. The great fall of general prices caught the whole body of producers in all countries where the gold standard was adopted, but a special source of suffering was super-added where, as in Lancashire, most of our products were consumed by silver-using countries. The exchange with India kept constantly falling just as silver fell in the open market. Merchants could never calculate what returns they would get for their goods. They might be shipped to India when exchange was 1*s.* 8*d.* or 1*s.* 10*d.*, and sold when remittances could only be made at 1*s.* 4*d.* or 1*s.* 6*d.* A great portion of the trade of Manchester became a mere lottery: a constant drain on its mercantile capital took place. Indeed, the commercial capital of Lancashire was alarmingly diminished, and investments in mill property, especially at Oldham, the seat of the "Limited Companies," became almost worthless. I am somewhat anticipating still later developments in these remarks. For the sake of clearness one has to look at the movement as a whole. Though a reaction occurred after 1886, the fall of silver and exchange, and the decline of general prices, set in again with increased severity till at last the rupee verged on 1*s.* in place of 2*s.* Silver fell to less than half its old value measured in gold, and prices in all gold-using countries reached the lowest point of the century. This point was reached in 1895–96.

The Indian Government experienced the full brunt of this difficulty. It collected its revenues in silver, mostly from land assessments fixed for long periods, but it had to remit in gold some seventeen millions sterling annually to Great Britain for payment of interest on borrowed capital, for pensions, army stores, etc. At 2*s.* a rupee seventeen crores of rupees discharged this debt, but at 1*s.* it would need thirty-four crores. There was no possibility of raising such a sum. Bankruptcy seemed within measurable distance unless the exchange could be raised and fixed on a permanent basis.

This group of questions revolved round one centre: whether

it was possible by monetary law to establish a fixed relation between gold and silver money. Mr. Stephen Williamson induced our Chamber of Commerce to form a committee of able merchants to study the problem in 1879, and we came to the conclusion that a League of Commercial States could do what France and the Latin Union did up till 1872–3, viz., fix a ratio between gold and silver quite independent of the variation in the production of the separate metals. In those days our most powerful opposition came from Manchester. It was so permeated by free-trade ideas that it seemed at first sight impossible to get it to face so artificial a remedy. A deputation of three of us was sent twice to address the Manchester Chamber of Commerce—Stephen Williamson and myself, with John Patterson and Mr. Coke alternately. We had most interesting debates, but were vehemently opposed by the bankers, and got little support from any quarter. Yet the seed then sown produced an abundant crop afterwards. I also conducted a long correspondence in the *Manchester Guardian*, which powerful paper afterwards espoused our views. Indeed, Manchester at last became the headquarters of the bimetallic movement, and from there it spread over most of Lancashire, which sent up a phalanx of members to Parliament pledged to a settlement on that basis. A deputation of us, headed by Stephen Williamson, also interviewed the Chancellor of the Exchequer—Sir Stafford Northcote—in 1879, and laid the resolutions of our chamber before him.

Unfortunately for our cause the long period of time needed to convert the country at large was fatal to its success. The nations of Europe, and still more the United States of America, were kept in suspense for some years, hoping that Great Britain would lead them to the formation of an international bimetallic league, but they could not long suspend definitive action. As the expectation became fainter one after another demonetized silver, always causing a fresh fall in prices. It became more and more hopeless to restore its old ratio, or any one approaching it. Indeed, silver lost caste, as one may say, and the drift towards gold became irresistible. A false idea prevailed that the commercial prosperity of England was connected with the gold standard. At last it became apparent that the resuscitation of the old system was hopeless. Fortunately at this time some great gold discoveries took place. The yield of the mines in South Africa increased immensely. The discoveries at Klondyke took place. The gold production shot up from twenty to fifty millions a year, and its beneficial effect developed in the

nineties, causing the last five years of the century to be times of great commercial prosperity.

Our agitation, it may be said, was defeated by the forces of Nature, and I frankly allow that a single standard has great advantages in many ways over a double one, and I also admit that I distrust international arrangements when vital issues are at stake. There is so much mutual jealousy among nations that one cannot wholly rely on honest fulfilment of pledges if hostility or even selfish interest intervene. Looking to the present isolation of our country, one cannot but feel it would be perilous if our financial arrangements depended upon other countries' fidelity to international engagements.

We attempted the impossible and we failed in our larger aims, but we secured a great and real advantage worth all the labour: we secured the solvency of the Government of India by paving the way for the adoption of what is virtually a bimetallic system there—I mean one in which gold and silver are rated to each other at fifteen rupees to a sovereign, or 1*s.* 4*d.* the rupee. For several years India has had a fixed exchange with this country, and the Government have been able to stand the terrible drain of two tremendous famines which otherwise would have landed them in something like insolvency. But for this arrangement the rupee would have fallen to 9*d.*, representing the present value of silver!

I cannot conceive that any such arrangement as this most successful one would have been possible but for the laborious efforts our League made for several years, both in and out of Parliament, to educate the nation. All the financial authorities at first, especially the banking interest, scoffed at the idea that Government could do anything to the precious metals beyond certifying the weight and fineness of the coins; but after the report of Lord Herschell's Committee, of which one half became bimetallic, afterwards reinforced by Leonard Courtney, expert opinion greatly changed; and, when Sir Henry Fowler's committee was appointed to deal with the monetary system of India, practically no opposition was offered to their finding, which was to make the British sovereign the supreme standard, but to rate the rupee to it at 1*s.* 4*d.* No doubt some suffering was caused by the change to the planting industries, especially tea and indigo, which had profited by the low exchange, but the solvency of the country was assured, and seldom have financial difficulties been more successfully surmounted. Among our comrades in the long conflict, I would especially signa-

lize Mr. Stephen Williamson, of Liverpool, Robert Barclay and Sir William Houldsworth of Manchester, and Hucks Gibbs, of London, afterwards created Lord Aldenham. Nor must we forget the splendid services of our indefatigable secretary, Henry McNeil.

When I think of this long campaign—lasting nearly twenty years—of the immense labour it caused, the great outlays it involved, and the zeal and enthusiasm it evoked, my mind goes back to the Southern confederacy, and its tremendous efforts destined to failure. For many years after its collapse the toast of "the fallen flag" used to be drunk in silence. We may also drop a tear on our fallen flag, but we feel that, as often happens, we secured a result of sterling worth, though far short of what we once dreamt of. Some of the leaders of this crusade have passed away, and most of the veterans who remain "lag superfluous on the stage"; but if these lines fall under their notice they will not object to this tribute to their memory. I reproduce in the Appendix (III.) one of my many addresses on this subject for those who wish to refresh their memories. It is entitled: "The sufferings caused by the Appreciation of the Gold Standard," delivered in Manchester in 1886.

CHAPTER XII

The City of Glasgow Bank Failure—The Bulgarian Atrocities — Agricultural Distress — Peasant Proprietary on the Continent—The Waldenses—Missionary Enterprises

RETURNING for a little to the later seventies, I would add that 1878 was memorable for the collapse of the City of Glasgow Bank in October—one of the worst disasters that ever happened in Scotland. Six millions sterling were lost through scandalous mismanagement, and all that huge sum was screwed out of the unhappy shareholders, or rather the small minority who were able to pay up call after call under unlimited liability. A group of rotten firms which leant upon the bank fell along with it, and not a few well-known names were besmirched by the painful disclosures. I never remember a time of deeper depression than 1878–9. Vast numbers of men were out of work in all our great cities, and credit was shaken to its foundations. Great political anxiety also existed. The long smouldering war between Russia and Turkey had broken out. Plevna was at last taken by the Russians after a long and disastrous siege, and their victorious armies poured over the Balkans, en route for Constantinople. Public feeling was tremendously excited in our country. Lord Beaconsfield and the Tory Party were strongly anti-Russian and pro-Turkish in spite of the horrible massacres in Bulgaria. From time to time British intervention on behalf of Turkey seemed imminent. Our fleet was sent up the Dardanelles to protect the Turkish capital. For the first time in my life I was forced to enter the political arena to protest against bolstering up the rule of the "unspeakable Turk." It was then that Mr. Gladstone (who had for some years practically retired from the leadership of the Liberal Party) roused the country to a flame by his denunciations of Turkish atrocities. By the mercy of God war was avoided. Russia agreed to the Berlin Conference where

Beaconsfield secured a nominal triumph by compelling her to surrender some of her conquests. He came home to London, having secured "Peace with Honour," as the phrase went in those days. I doubt if there lives a single British statesman who to-day feels proud of that achievement. Certainly not Lord Salisbury, who told us not long ago that "we had put our money on the wrong horse." Lord Beaconsfield dissolved Parliament in 1880, expecting a new lease of power, but Mr. Gladstone's marvellous Midlothian campaign literally tore to pieces the pro-Turkish policy of Great Britain, and it fell in the general election, never to rise again. This event threw me at last into the great stream of national politics. Till then I had purposely eschewed them, not wishing to be diverted from the engrossing occupations of philanthropy. I was made to feel then that one cannot isolate civic from national duty, that in the last resort all right and wrong doing affect the nation, and that we have public duties on the national scale as urgent as those that are local and personal.

But before turning to this let me add something about the state of the country in 1879. The season was the worst known in our time. It rained almost the whole summer. It was so cold even in July that we had to keep on fires as in winter time. The harvest was so bad that taking all crops into account the loss was put at fifty millions. Yet prices, for the reason I have given, remained very low. Agricultural distress now became even worse than commercial distress, were such a thing possible. For several years the moan of suffering farmers and landlords never ceased. Crowds of agricultural labourers drifted into our towns for want of employment, and the miserable wages paid in England were further reduced. The depopulation of the rural districts became one of the burning questions of the time. I may add that one of the strongest motive powers in the bimetallic movement came from the agricultural class, when at last it fairly grasped the fact that gold had greatly risen in value, while prices had fallen enormously, yet that a huge annual payment in gold had to be made every year, fixed long before, when prices were far higher.[1] The same cause brought

[1] I may illustrate this by a typical case. An English farm in 1870 was rented at £200, and the produce sold from the farm came to £500, leaving a surplus of £300 for the farmer's profit and labourers' wages, say £150 to each. But in 1885, after a fall of 40 per cent. in prices, the rent with great difficulty was lowered by £50, or 25 per cent. (this was the average fall in rents). So he now paid £150 rent, but only received £300 for the sale of his produce, leaving £150 to divide between himself and his labourers. By starving labour and throwing crop land into grass he got

to a height the agricultural distress in Ireland. The landlords were exacting impossible rents, yet were themselves pressed with enormous mortgages and claims of all kinds, fixed when prices were far higher. Things had reached a hopeless *impasse*. It was as when two men meet each other on the edge of a precipice, and one or other must fall over as there is not room to pass. Evictions took place by thousands, and the country was almost in a state of rebellion.

This condition of things led me to study the land laws of the Continent, and especially the system of peasant proprietary so general in Central Europe. We made three long autumn trips in 1879, 1880, and 1881, through Belgium, Germany, Austria, Switzerland and North Italy. My friend, Dr. Lundie, was of our party on several occasions. An excellent linguist, well acquainted with the Protestants of the Continent, he greatly aided me in enquiring into the agricultural condition of the people. I was much enamoured in those days of the system of peasant proprietary. It produced such thrift and industry, and seemed to root the population to the soil so much better than our British system. It enabled more than half the population of France, Germany, Switzerland and Italy, to live on small holdings of their own, while with us the population was drifting faster and faster into towns, and losing the homely virtues of rural life. I suppose not more than one-sixth or one-seventh of the population of Great Britain is now directly engaged in the cultivation of the soil—a condition never found in any great nation before in the world's history.

down his labour bill to £100, and so had only £50 left to himself for interest on capital and wages for management. I believe this is a true picture of the Eastern and Southern counties, where thousands of farmers became bankrupt, and many of their farms remained unlet for years and were abandoned to weeds, and no one would take them even rent free on condition of paying the tithe.

The landlords suffered nearly as much. Take a typical case of an estate of nominal rent of £10,000 a year, with fixed charges of £5,000 a year, including necessary repairs and a large ancestral mansion to keep up, with a retinue of old retainers. In 1870 the proprietor would have a free income of £5,000, but after 25 per cent. fall in rents his total nominal rent would be £7,500, and his free income only £2,500. This would not suffice to keep up his large mansion, so he was obliged to let it and perhaps live abroad for economy. Over a great part of England the old mansion houses were now let to strangers, and the old family estates were often sold. Matters have somewhat improved the last few years, and various readjustments have taken place. Only half as much wheat is grown and the amount of labour employed is far smaller, but real prosperity has not returned, except in the neighbourhood of towns where market gardening or something analogous to it is adopted.

For this reason I afterwards supported all Mr. Gladstone's legislation to root the peasantry in the soil of Ireland, and all the measures passed to create small holdings, labourers' allotments, etc., in our country. I confess to disappointment at the small result of these measures in Great Britain. The drift from the country still continues, and apparently nothing can stop it. No doubt this is largely the result of our free-trade policy which makes food extremely cheap. All the Continental nations keep up the price of food by heavy duties on foreign imports. Their huge agrarian interests dominate their legislatures. The millions of peasant proprietors vote for dear bread, but with us the six-sevenths of the population interested in cheap food far outweigh the small minority interested in dear food. There is a manifest destiny in nations which no laws can circumvent, and the drift of England is all towards trade and manufactures. But we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that the vast rural populations of the Continent form the backbone of their national armies. The strong arms and frugal habits of the peasantry fit them for hardships as no town training can do, nor is there nearly so large a mass of social wreckage as we have in our great cities. Our life is far more artificial.

> Ill fares the land to hastening ills a prey,
> Where wealth accumulates and men decay.

Yet a fuller knowledge of the peasant proprietary of the Continent has considerably diminished its charms. It produces not only thrift but sordidness. It causes unwholesome methods of keeping down population so as to prevent further subdivision (already the average holding of peasants is only five acres in France), and these little proprietors are subject to heavy mortgages, the interest on which is quite as great as the rent paid in the United Kingdom to landlords. I append as a note a quotation I made years ago from the *Moniteur des Intérêts Matériels*.[1] These debts

[1] One of the recent numbers of the *Moniteur des Intérêts Matériels* contains a long and interesting review of the European harvest. In the course of its observations on the severe strain which American and Indian competition has put upon European cereal growers, some remarkable figures are given of the indebtedness of cultivators. The mortgages upon agricultural properties, upon the cultivators and peasant owners in most parts of the old Continent are excessive, and materially increase the difficulties which low prices have brought upon them. Thus, for instance, the *dette hypothécaire* of Prussia was on an average only 65 per cent. of the value of the land in 1860, and it is now between 80 and 90 per cent. In certain parts of the province of Brandenburg it exceeds by 50 per cent. the present value of the land. In Austria the mortgages aggregated £112,000,000 in 1858, and they are

are largely owed to Jews, especially in Central Europe. The interest is extorted by ruthless means which often produce intense hatred, and the Judenhätze has reached an intensity in Austria and Russia and parts of Germany which threatens a social cataclysm. Any one can see at a glance that the practical enhancement of this enormous debt by at least twenty-five per cent., owing to the demonetization of silver and the adoption of a gold standard, was a cruel injustice to the multitude of small struggling peasants who had not financial knowledge to grasp its consequences. It amounted to this: that a peasant who produced say £40 worth of produce up to 1870, and used to pay a fourth of it, say £10, as interest on his bond, saw his produce fall to £30 (in spite of heavy duties on foreign food), and yet had to pay the same £10 as before. So his free income became £20 instead of £30. This feeling underlies the present agrarian movement in Germany, which is forcing the Government to raise the duties on foreign food, even at the cost of a war of tariffs, and of great friction with Russia and Austria.

So great is the solidarity of mankind that it may be truly said, "If one member suffer, all members suffer with it." Some of the greatest evils might be avoided if nations would seek to act together instead of treating each other as enemies. But the Press is now so largely owned by unscrupulous financiers that the truth is seldom told. It suits corrupt and selfish cliques to keep up national hatreds. Future dangers to peace proceed far more from this cause than from the ambition of governments. South Africa is a crucial instance. The Press on both sides worked for war, not peace, and we see the result. "Quicquid delirant reges, plectuntur Achivi": only the form of the motto should now be, "delirant scriptores, gentes plectuntur."

On one of these trips we visited the Waldensian valleys in the north of Italy, and attended the Protestant Synod at Latour. We visited the scenes of the terrible persecutions and marvellous deliverances of this heroic race. Again and again the valleys were almost swept of their inhabitants by the merciless soldiers of the Duke of Savoy, instigated by the Popes of the day. No part of Europe so teems with martyrs' memorials. On one occasion the whole population was destroyed or exiled; yet a gallant band of

now more than £500,000,000. Those of France were already in 1876 at the fabulous figure of twenty-one milliards 111 millions of francs, or say in round figures £840,000,000. Half the real estate of France, and two-thirds of that of Belgium are only nominally in the possession of the ostensible proprietors.

refugees crossed the Alps from Switzerland in the winter and again settled in the upper valleys, and from them the existing population has sprung. All know the noble sonnet of Milton :—

Avenge, O Lord, Thy slaughtered saints whose bones
Lie scattered on the Alpine mountains cold ;
Even them who kept Thy truth so pure of old,
When all our fathers worshipped stocks and stones,
Forget not ; in Thy book record their groans
Who were Thy sheep, and in their ancient fold
Slain by the bloody Piedmontese, that roll'd
Mother with infant down the rocks. Their moans
The vales redoubled to the hills, and they
To heaven. Their martyred blood and ashes sow
O'er all the Italian fields, where still doth sway
The triple tyrant ; that from these may grow
A hundred fold, who, having learned Thy way
Early may fly the Babylonian woe.

The history of this noble race should be kept alive in all Protestant lands. Few realize nowadays at what a cost religious liberty was purchased, and for how long over much of Europe it was stamped out by wholesale massacre. The claims of Rome stand to-day exactly where they stood three centuries ago. She has not revoked a single intolerant doctrine. The irreclaimable heretic is still held to be punishable with death, and in the ranks of such heretics she puts many of the noblest and best of the sons of men. It is lack of power, not of will, that has stayed the persecutor in modern times. Charity is a good thing, but truth is a better ; and there is need to remind each generation of the cost at which liberty was purchased. " The price of liberty is eternal vigilance."

I took an increasing interest in the evangelical churches of the Continent, especially in Italy and France, and paid a visit with my friend Dr. Lundie on another occasion to the churches founded by John Huss in Bohemia and Moravia. It is curious how little the boundary line has altered between Catholic and Protestant since the Reformation, or perhaps I should say, since the Thirty Years' War. One sees in the Swiss Cantons, and in many parts of Germany and Austria almost the exact line of cleavage made two or three centuries ago ! There have been of late signs in Austria of a larger movement towards Protestantism more on a national scale, and probably caused by racial as much as religious feeling. The Pan-German sentiment, which is now very strong, and the racial antagonism to the Slav race, are tending to draw the Austro-Germans

more towards Lutheranism, and I should not be surprised to see a great movement in that direction.

I may add here that I was also led to take increased interest in the spread of the gospel in heathen lands, and became responsible for a special mission to India conducted by my friend, W. A. Hobbs, aided by two native evangelists. It was carried on for some years with much success, partly under the supervision of my friend, Edward White, and the quarterly reports of Mr. Hobbs, describing his preaching tours in the interior, were full of interest. I also about this time aided my friend, Dr. Grattan Guinness, in his first attempt to open up the great region of the Congo recently discovered by Stanley, and have watched with pleasure the wonderful success of this difficult enterprise. So malarious was this region that most of the early pioneers laid down their lives in a few years; yet a constant stream of volunteers went forth, and at last a great work was consolidated—Christian churches established over thousands of miles of waterways in Central Africa, and such arrangements for health made as to make life at least fairly tolerable for Europeans. I have lived to see Africa from being a geographical expression—a trackless wilderness—a terra incognita—pierced in all directions by roads and waterways, to see a railway to the Victoria Nyanza and almost to the Zambesi, to see the Congo as well as the Niger and the Upper Nile ploughed by steamers, also the great central lakes; and the prayer of Livingstone almost fulfilled, that "the open sore of Africa"—the detestable slave trade—should be closed.

We sometimes forget, amid the dust and din and endless worry of African troubles, how many permanent gains have been reaped. Our own country has made great mistakes, but it has also done noble work. Uganda, Nyassa and Livingstonia are stars of the first magnitude in the Christian firmament. The pioneers of the early missions have passed away, but their works do follow them, and posterity will award them a place not second to that of Augustine or St. Columba.

CHAPTER XIII

Liverpool Temperance Work—Political Situation in Liverpool—"Craigieburn"

I JOINED the "Permissive Bill Association" at a very early stage, and took a great interest in its work in Liverpool in the seventies, and even earlier. My friend, W. S. Caine, afterward M.P., threw himself into the temperance work of Liverpool with great enthusiasm, and the annual meetings of the United Kingdom Alliance, at which Sir Wilfrid Lawson was an honoured guest, were always most successful. I suppose no city in the kingdom suffered so much from drunkenness and squalid vice as Liverpool did in those days. A great part of the population lived, as I have already said, in enclosed "courts" or areas, devoid of light and ventilation. The environment was most depressing both physically and morally. Those dreary slums had no gaslight at night. The people were sometimes little better than savages. The children were often maimed by their drunken parents. The women engaged in hand to hand fights, and the police court each Monday morning exhibited a mass of blackened eyes and broken heads, showing how the Sunday had been spent. At every point where the drink seller could catch this helpless population the licensing magistrates of those days had placed a public house. Even in streets where the people were in rags and tatters the drinkshops at each end took thousands of pounds from their earnings, and huge fortunes were made by the publican interest, especially the great brewers, some of whom left millions!

In those days the highest civic honours were given to the leaders in this trade. The Watch Committee of the Town Council, whose duty it was to keep a vigorous oversight over the public houses, was dominated by the drink trade. It was impossible to get any real control over this running sore. The licensing magistrates renewed all licenses as a matter of course, and "great grog," as it

was called in those days, ruled Liverpool, as Tammany Hall till quite recently ruled New York. But the greatness of the evil called forth gigantic efforts to combat it. Foremost among the liberators was my dear friend, Alexander Balfour, one of the finest, noblest, and most high-minded men I have ever known. He went into the Town Council to fight this demon, and for a long time almost single handed kept the flag of temperance reform flying at the masthead. Mr. Caine twice contested Liverpool in the seventies, and did immense service to the same cause. He has all his life been a convinced advocate of local option, and he committed the Liberal Party in Liverpool to this advanced view. Though defeated both times he greatly furthered the cause by his able advocacy. In those times Liverpool became a leading centre of agitation for licensing reform. I attended many interesting conferences to sketch out projects of legislation. I remember at one of these meetings a then very youthful-looking man, who took a strong line for local option. He was reputed to have convinced the Town Council of Birmingham, and to be the rising Hector of the Temperance and Radical Party there. This was Joseph Chamberlain some thirty years ago! Alas! now we may say with Aeneas: "Quantum mutatus ab illo Hectore qui redit exuvias indutus Achilli." At these conferences some of our first citizens met under the leadership of Alexander Balfour. Afterwards my friend, Dr. Lundie, took up this cause with extraordinary tenacity, attended the annual licensing sessions, exposed the shocking neglect of both magistrates and police to enforce the licensing laws, and lived to see an entire change in public opinion. It may be anticipating a little, but I would bear witness to the immense improvement carried out by the licensing Bench in subsequent years. From being perhaps the most backward city in the kingdom Liverpool has for several years taken the lead in licensing reform. It was the first to require publicans to pledge themselves not to serve children with drink under the age of thirteen years. It did so on its own responsibility long before Parliament interposed, and so paved the way for the recent Act. It also steadily reduced superfluous licenses and adopted such strict rules for the conduct of houses that drunkenness diminished greatly. No doubt many agencies acted in the same direction, chief among which was the great increase of places of temperance refreshment, to which I have already referred.

I was urged to enter the Town Council in order to help forward this movement, and though loaded with work of other kinds and

suffering from attacks of sleeplessness caused by overstrain, I felt it my duty to do so, and was elected by Castle Street Ward in 1879. I was not long enough in the Council to take a full grasp of its work, for my election to Parliament three years after obliged me to resign my seat. We were then beginning the demolition of unhealthy areas. My work on the Health Committee taught me the utterly insanitary condition of the city. The death rate was one of the highest in the kingdom. At one time (1866) in the past century it stood as high as 41·7 per thousand; and even up to recent years certain parts of Liverpool, like Scotland and Vauxhall Wards, had about as great a mortality. In 1900 it was 23·1 per thousand. No surer gauge can be given of the moral and physical conditions of a city population than its death rate. Temperance and thrift go along with clean and wholesome dwellings and well-fed and well-clothed families. Drunkenness causes a vast infant mortality and the premature death of the old and feeble. In no respect have we progressed more of late years than in sanitation. I venture to say that it is possible to bring the death rate in all our cities below twenty in the thousand—indeed, in some cases to fifteen or sixteen per thousand—by well-conceived sanitary measures, supported by religion and temperance. "Godliness is profitable for all things, having the promise both of this life and of that which is to come."

The increase of the British population of late years is mainly owing to a lower death rate. The birth rate has also largely declined, which is not so satisfactory. I fear that marriages unduly deferred are not a good sign of national progress, but a reasonable foresight and prudence are necessary. Our lower classes used to be wholly wanting in these qualities, but this cannot be said now, while the middle and upper classes are, in my estimation, erring quite as much in the other direction. I rejoice to think that of recent years great sanitary reforms have been carried through. Much of the worst property is being destroyed or is scheduled for destruction; building regulations (which were once shamefully lax) are far more vigorously enforced. Large areas have been built on—like the Parliament Fields by my late colleague, John Roberts, M.P.—under restrictions forbidding the public house. Liverpool is stretching out long arms into the country, and a splendid system of electric tramways spreads the population round the suburbs. This is the real secret of "housing the poor." It is to give a cheap and quick transit to the outskirts. Tax all unused "building land" so as

to bring it promptly into the market, and so to spread the population over a wider area, and, wherever possible, have large districts kept free from the drink trade. Experience proves that where these "cities of refuge" are found, the best of the working class throng into them. Their children grow up far healthier. The death rate is much lower, the rateable value much higher. In the prohibited area in Toxteth Park the death rate is ten to fourteen per thousand; while in the other portion of the park, where the public house is in evidence, the death rate is forty-one per thousand.[1]

Liverpool was in those days what is called a "three-cornered" constituency: it returned three members, but each elector had only two votes, and the practical effect was that the Liberal Party, which was always in a minority, returned one of the three members at the General Election. Birmingham and Manchester in the same

[1] Toxteth, Liverpool, is a striking example of the results of keeping out the Liquor Traffic from a district.

Some thirty years since the owner of a large estate, to be laid out for building, applied the direct veto. By a clause in all leases the Sale of Intoxicating Liquor on this estate was prohibited. It covers more than half the area of the township of Toxteth in the South of Liverpool. The Parliamentary Division of East Toxteth is almost entirely under prohibition, with many portions outside that division. *There are now nearly* 200 *streets, containing about* 12,000 *houses, with a population of at least* 60,000, *without a public house in their midst.*

By the returns of the Medical Officers of Health for 1891, it is shown that in the districts where public houses abound, the death rate is as high as forty-one per thousand per annum, while in one portion of the prohibited area the death rate is as low as ten to twelve per thousand, and in another proportion of the district the death rate is only fourteen per thousand.

Nine-tenths of the applications for parish relief come from the district where public houses and typhus prevail. From the prohibited area pauperism is a vanishing quantity. The poor rates have gone down from 2*s.* 6*d.* in the pound to 10*d.* or 1*s.* By this partial prohibition the ratepayers of Toxteth are saved over £20,000 per annum in poor rates alone.

A house agent recently made a comparison of the net annual receipts from rents of 443 houses in the Toxteth district, under prohibition, occupied by working people, with the annual rental of 482 houses of similar size and structure in a district with public houses at every corner.

This comparison shows the following astounding results:

The rents received during a year from the 443 houses was £8,744, while from the 482 houses the rent received during the same period was only £6,268, giving an advantage to prohibition of £2,475 per annum, that is, of over 30 per cent. ! ! House property near public houses shows as a rule similar results.

Within the prohibited area the people are clean and respectable in appearance, the children comfortably clothed and fed, the efficient board schools well attended, the attendance at public worship on Sundays is above the average, the police have an easy time of it, pawnshops and bridewells are conspicuous by their absence.—Extract from pamphlet by Edward Jones, B.A.

way returned each one Tory and two Liberal members. The Tory majority in Liverpool at a General Election was usually about 2,000. The Irish Party usually voted with the Liberals, but it was unreliable, and when Parnell came to lead it was sometimes thrown into the other side. William Rathbone was long our respected minority member, but he gave up his seat to contest South-West Lancashire and failed, and when he again entered Parliament it was for Carnarvonshire. In May, 1880, a bye election was suddenly sprung upon us by the death of John Torr, M.P., and the Liberals secured Lord Ramsay as the candidate in opposition to Edward Whitley. Lord Ramsay was an engaging candidate in the prime of life. He had served in the Navy, and through the death of an uncle had become heir to the Dalhousie title and peerage. He made a gallant fight and excited immense enthusiasm, but Mr. Whitley got in by over 2,000 majority. At this election the question of Irish Home Rule came to the front for the first time. Lord Ramsay agreed to vote for an enquiry into the Irish demand, and so he encountered strenuous opposition from the strong Orange and Protestant element in Liverpool. Mr. Whitley was highly popular with that section of the population, and he had besides endeared himself by quiet unassuming philanthropy, and by gaining for the city the great Lyon Jones bequest of £300,000.

At the General Election of April, 1880, Mr. Gladstone came into power by an immense majority over both Conservatives and Home Rulers combined. No contest took place in Liverpool, and Lord Ramsay was returned for the minority seat, but he only sat for a few months, for the death of his father sent him to the Upper House, and so we had another bye election in July, 1880. There was great difficulty in getting a candidate. I was privately asked to stand, but declined to consider the question, and nothing was known of it publicly. I did not in those days contemplate entering Parliament, and, being in rather weak health did not feel equal to the gigantic effort of contesting a constituency of 550,000 inhabitants. Mr. Samuel Plimsoll, the sailors' friend, was asked, and consented, but he was defeated by Lord George Hamilton; so the three members for Liverpool were all Tories.

The early eighties—say 1880–82—were years of great activity in Liverpool. My work in the Town Council took increasing time. I was on three committees weekly, and aided Mr. Balfour in his noble stand for temperance reform. I carried a resolution

through the Council in 1881 (somewhat amended), which was virtually the assertion of the principle of "Local Option":—

"That this Council petition Parliament to pass as speedily as possible a bill dealing with the licensing system as a whole, and embracing as two of its main objects the granting of adequate powers to the ratepayers, or to a representative licensing authority, to restrict largely the facilities for the sale and consumption of intoxicating liquors, and the means whereby the present system, which has created a virtual monopoly, may be brought to an end, and future vested interests be prevented from springing up, by such amendments in the law as Parliament may in its wisdom provide."

getting the support of several Conservatives; and nothing could better show the change that had passed over Liverpool opinion on the subject of the drink traffic.

We also expended much labour in these years on launching University College. Led by one enthusiastic pioneer, Mr. William Rathbone, we acquired the property at the head of Brownlow Hill, where now stands that noble pile of buildings, face to face with another splendid monument of Liverpool munificence—the new Infirmary. We had to choose our first Principal, Dr. Rendall, who thoroughly justified our choice, and the first staff of professors, besides drawing up our Constitution and getting our Charter. All this involved great labour. I was also full of philanthropic work, with daily committees and incessant night engagements, while a large business made heavy demands on my strength. From time to time I had warnings that the nervous system was overstrained, but my autumn trips usually removed these symptoms. In 1882 we adopted the plan of taking a country house in Scotland, in place of going abroad, and for some years had the pretty romantic cottage of "Craigieburn," near to Moffat. My brother James had bought the beautiful property of Craigielands, a few miles away, and it was an inducement to us to take our annual holiday in the neighbourhood.

I had no intention in those days to change the plan of my life. I had the work I liked best in Liverpool, and as much as fully tasked my strength and means, and was looking forward to spending more time in the country as life went on, and resuming some of my old literary tastes which haunted me like a lovely vision, never realized, yet always pursued.

How this dream was dispelled, I must now relate.

CHAPTER XIV

Mr. Gladstone and the Irish Question—I am adopted as Liberal Candidate for Liverpool—The Election Campaign—I become Liberal Member for Liverpool—Social Reform—"Saving the Children"

MR. GLADSTONE'S government took office in 1880, and found itself confronted with two burning questions. No British statesman has ever been more anxious than he was to avoid foreign entanglements, or felt more averse to extending still further our enormous empire; yet he was forced most unwillingly to put down the revolt of Arabi Pasha in Egypt, and virtually to place England in the position of a protecting Power. The steps which led up to this are too recent to need mention. I only allude to them as bearing on the next step in my life. The other great difficulty was the state of Ireland. I have already shown how the great fall in the price of agricultural produce made Irish rents, as well as British, impossibly high; but in Ireland impecunious landlords had to force on evictions on a scale never known in Great Britain. Intense misery was caused, especially in the south and west of Ireland. A violent outbreak of agrarian crime took place. The "Land League" was formed, under the leadership of Mr. Parnell and Michael Davitt, and the Government of the country was confronted by a determined defiance of the law. Most Liberals were convinced that the rank injustice of the land laws of Ireland lay at the bottom of these troubles. Such was my own view. I had been devoting much time of late years to the study of Irish history. I had read Lecky's terrible indictment of the shocking penal code of the eighteenth century, and the corrupt means by which the Act of Union was carried. I entirely approved of Mr. Gladstone's policy to reform the land laws of Ireland, and watched with deep sympathy the passing of the Land Act of 1881. In spite of bitter criticism, I still consider it as one of the greatest

achievements of his life. Had the great fall in prices not continued for several years longer—caused in the main by the demonetization of silver and the appreciation of gold—the Act would have gone far to settle the land question. Unfortunately, the rents fixed in 1881–82 were found after a few years to be quite too high, and fresh agitation led to further legislation.

But the passing of the remedial Act of 1881 did not allay the discontent of Ireland. Larger schemes loomed before the minds of the Nationalist leaders. While only a small minority contemplated rebellion, the mass of the Catholic peasantry took up with avidity Parnell's scheme of Home Rule.

In May, 1882, the country was startled one Sunday morning by the news of the shocking assassination of Lord Frederick Cavendish and Mr. Burke in the Phoenix Park, in broad daylight. I never remember to have seen such horror depicted on men's countenances. Lord Frederick Cavendish had gone as Mr. Gladstone's ambassador of peace and goodwill to Ireland. He was a man of noble character, and Mr. Burke, the permanent Under Secretary, was also much esteemed. For a brief moment it seemed as if all attempts at conciliation were hopeless. Fortunately, the very next day came out a stern denunciation of the crime by Parnell, Davitt, and Dillon, which was backed by up Nationalist opinion all over Ireland. It came to be known that this crime was the work of a murder society called the "Invincibles," formed in America, and all the facts were disclosed by an informer soon after. But the government of Ireland for some time was hardly possible on constitutional lines. Juries were terrorised, and dared not convict assassins, and anarchy and crime overspread the country. Mr. Forster had long been a philanthropist and a friend of Ireland. He had carried relief in the famine of 1847. He was of Quaker origin, with all the humanitarian sympathies of that body. He had done noble work for national education, and undertook the post of Irish Secretary in 1880, with the most humane intentions. Yet he had to ask for coercive powers which he used to lock up Parnell and some of the Irish agitators without trial. Mr. Gladstone and he at last differed in this policy. He resigned the post of Chief Secretary. Parnell and his confrères were released, and Lord Frederick Cavendish was sent in his place to try conciliation. The terrible crime in Phoenix Park threw Ireland into the melting pot again. The party of coercion was strengthened; the party of conciliation was weakened. Parliamentary

business had been extremely difficult in 1880 and 1881, in consequence of systematic obstruction. There was then no legal means of closing debate, and when coercive legislation was introduced the Irish Party kept the House sitting night after night by sending relays of members to talk incessantly. Speaker Brand made a new precedent in 1881 by closuring a debate which had lasted 41½ hours; and in the following year Lyon Playfair, Chairman of Committee, "suspended" a large number of Irish members for obstruction. But it was felt by all that rules had to be laid down which would extricate Parliament from this hopeless deadlock. An autumn session was called in 1882 to pass these rules. The closure was for the first time made legal in the British Parliament. Every precaution was taken to guard the rights of members, and not many years passed till it was found that the new rules were far too lax, and the hydra of "obstruction" soon raised its head again. However, on the principle that "any stick was good enough to beat a dog," Mr. Gladstone was accused of destroying the liberties of the British Parliament, and was equally attacked by the Conservatives and the Irish Nationalists; by the one because he had yielded to intimidation, and thrown the Irish landlords to the wolves: by the other because he had suspended their constitutional liberties and passed a Coercion Act! It is the usual fate of all great reformers to be attacked on both flanks. The vested interests that are threatened combine for self-protection, and the classes they seek to benefit join in the clamour because they do not get boons that are impossible. The Irish peasants were led to hope that they would get the land rent free if they obtained a Parliament of their own, and when they were only offered fair rents fixed by a land court each fifteen years, with "tenant right" such as had long been enjoyed in Ulster, they scorned the light bread and listened to the agitators who promised them the flesh pots of Egypt. On the other hand, the landlords whose rents were cut down some twenty per cent., and who lost the power of arbitrary eviction, and whose tenants at will became freemen and no longer trembled at their frown, were implacable in their animosity to Mr. Gladstone. In their eyes he was a confiscator and a shielder of criminal anarchy. The landed class, and indeed the capitalist class generally in Great Britain, agreed with them. All holders of vested rights, all who doubted the moral validity of their title to property—especially the licensed victuallers—joined in the phalanx of opposition to Mr. Gladstone. I

am not overstating the case when I say that Mr. Gladstone at that time attracted an animosity greater than any statesman since the days of Cromwell. Yet none ever received such passionate homage, and I was one of those who loved him with almost chivalrous devotion.

A sudden bye election occurred in Liverpool in November, 1882, through the elevation of our respected member, Lord Sandon, to the House of Lords on the death of his father, Lord Harrowby. The Liberal Committee of management was then presided over by Stephen Guion, the popular manager of the Guion line of steamers to New York. He was asked to stand as Liberal candidate, but, being in poor health, he declined. I was then sounded as to my willingness, but declined to consider the question. I did not wish to give up my local Liverpool life, nor did I feel strong enough to contest a city of 550,000 people as one Parliamentary borough with 70,000 electors. I was not strong physically. My voice was weak, and I was unfitted by temperament and constitution for the rough and tumble life of a popular politician. However, a few days after a deputation came to see me, consisting of my friend, R. D. Holt, at that time the popular leader of the Liberal Party, John Patterson, W. P. Sinclair, and John Stevenson, and they pressed me very much to reconsider my decision. This was on Saturday, and they left me till noon on Monday to give my final decision. I never was placed in a more difficult dilemma. The request was too weighty to put aside hastily. If I did wish to enter public life I would never again have so great an opportunity, for the contest would be one of national interest. I then thought there was hardly a chance of success, and the utmost it would entail would be a brief, hot, severe, contest with the choice of the "minority seat" at the next General Election. On the other hand, I dreaded the breaking up of my home life, and all the loving ties of happy service that had gathered round me in the last twenty-five years. I found my friends all in favour of my accepting the invitation, my brothers strongly so, and I owe it to my brother James to say that but for his loyal support, and the burden of business he willingly took off my shoulders, I should not have been able to accept. My dear friend, W. P. Lockhart, also Alexander Balfour, John Patterson, and others whom I consulted, were equally decided. I scarcely slept all night, and felt the misery of indecision that Sunday, and on Monday morning arose unable to make up my mind. I have seldom or never felt

the arguments so equally balanced, or a decision so difficult to make. My wife and family rather leant to my acceptance, thinking of nothing but the highest good, though well aware that it would break up our happy home. I came down to the Committee on Monday morning still irresolute.

But suddenly the idea flashed across me to leave the decision to them, after putting every argument against my acceptance as strongly as I could. I did so, and they unanimously chose me. I felt that this settled the question: I had no more doubts. I knew it was a Providential leading, and now, looking back after twenty years of Parliamentary service, I feel I was sent into that arena of service not of myself, but by a Higher Power.

My opponent was Mr. A. B. Forwood (afterwards Sir Arthur Forwood), the leader of the Conservative party in Liverpool, ex-Mayor, and a most able municipal administrator—one who had played in Liverpool a part similar to what Joseph Chamberlain had played in the municipal life of Birmingham. He was incomparably better equipped for public life than I was. I had the start by a few days, as he was on his way home from New York. So pressing was the contest that I had no time to prepare speeches. I always spoke extempore, and believe I had not more than a sheet of note paper to aid my memory during the whole contest! I appeared on the Tuesday before "the Liberal 900," and made my profession of faith, speaking seventy minutes and putting my strength into questions of social reform. I fought the election mainly upon them. I had been among the poorest and most miserable part of the population for years. I knew their wretchedness, I felt the disgrace and the danger of having this slum population in our midst, and I put their emancipation from drunkenness and squalor as the chief work of the legislature. All through the contest I adhered to this line, and separated myself from the extreme free-trade section of the party, who thought that Richard Cobden and John Bright had spoken the last words of wisdom. I advocated Lord Shaftesbury's Factory Acts as being equally necessary with Cobden's free trade. At my great meeting in Hengler's Circus, where I addressed 4,000 electors, I broke with the ultra free-trade principles which many of our party had preached as a Gospel. I said:—

> It is my belief that all densely-peopled countries like ours, where the struggle of life is very great, where competition is very strong, require a great deal of Social Legislation. Were it not for that, the

weak and the helpless part of society would be trodden down in the hot competition of life ; and I am amongst those who believe that the Liberalism of to-day must embrace two distinct elements. It must embrace the clear economic views associated with the names of Cobden and Bright, and it must also carry out in its fulness the Christian philanthropy of Lord Shaftesbury. I am not amongst those who believe that there is any such thing as finality in politics. I believe that each age brings to light new wants and new necessities, and the business of Government is patiently and wisely to adapt itself to the needs of each age ; and though it is true that the last forty years have wrought a wondrous change in the social life of England, in the way of sweetening the elements of human society, I believe there is yet much more work to be done. We still have in England far too many of what I may call the down-trodden class—down trodden, no doubt, very much by their own vices and their own weaknesses, too much the slaves of circumstances which they themselves have brought about—but still, I say, considering the high position which we hold in the world, considering our enlightenment, our liberty and our wealth, we ought not, at this time of the day, to have these great masses of helpless, degraded creatures, which form so miserable a spectacle in all our great towns.

This has been my creed all through my public life, and now, when it is nearly over, quite as much as twenty years ago, I also hold, as strongly as when I used them, the following words :—

I wish to say, in the first place, that I am a loyal and devoted subject of her Majesty Queen Victoria. There is no one in the town of Liverpool, be he Conservative or Liberal, to whom I would yield in respect and affection for our great and glorious British Constitution. I can take up and echo much of the language which was used from this platform last night, and it is a pleasant thing to think that my area of belief covers so much common ground with that of the Conservative party. It was said last night that some of the present advisers of her Majesty are Republicans. I don't know whether this be true or not, but I think it was a very wide shot. I think it has gone considerably past the mark ; but whatever any one else may be, secretly or avowedly, I am here to say that I am thoroughly satisfied with the Constitution under which we live. I have no objection to Republicanism in Republican countries. I believe in America a Republic is the best form of Government possible. I believe also in Switzerland it is the best form of Government possible ; but I am here to say to-night that I believe our mixed and well-balanced Constitution is the best form of Government, and the most suitable, for this ancient country.

I wish further to say that I believe with some of the speakers last night, that Religion lies at the basis of the social edifice. I believe that no durable structure of Government can be built up in this or any other country, except on the basis of our common Christianity. I believe that the principles of Christianity ought to penetrate and inform all the legislation of our country. I will venture to say that I

think we might define true Liberalism to be an expansion of the golden rule, that rule which tells us to do to others as we would they should do unto us. I believe that the business of a true statesman is to interpret that rule with reference to all the exigencies of life, and I believe that just in proportion as our legislation is built upon the great principles of righteousness, justice and truth, just in that proportion will the country flourish and its prosperity remain unimpaired.

I accepted Mr. Gladstone with enthusiasm as my leader. I said of him :—

I have felt myself in entire sympathy with the whole scope of his life and work. I have had for him something more than admiration—I might almost say veneration. I have felt that he was the incarnation, so to speak, of the highest ideal of political morality to which this country had ever attained. I have felt that he impersonated, as it were, the political conscience of the nation, and that he had lifted up this great empire to a higher ideal of right and wrong in regard to the great questions of government than it had ever attained to before.[1]

The enthusiasm grew as the contest went on, and the result was an astonishment to us all. I was at the head of the poll by 309 votes. We were gathered at the Reform Club, Dale Street, waiting the announcement, which arrived at 6.30 p.m. Dale Street was a dense mass of human beings. I have been in many elections and political gatherings, but I never saw such enthusiasm. The cheering was so constant that one could only speak into the ears of the reporters. Liverpool had been so long hopelessly Tory that it seemed past praying for from a Liberal point of view. At the Junior Reform Club the excitement was even greater. It seemed as if the very air were rent with acclamation. These young enthusiasts were under the mighty spell of Mr. Gladstone, who impersonated to them the triumph of " Christian " over " Apollyon." Alas ! we know too well how slow and painful is the upward march of humanity. The days have long passed since I believed in legislating to bring on the millennium. Yet there are times when it is well to let off one's pent-up longings for the " new heaven and new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness." Were it not for youthful enthusiasm no progress would be possible. The inert mass of selfishness and prejudice could never be pushed aside. This fight was one in which thousands of ardent Liberals thought they saw

[1] See Appendix IV., where my speech in Hengler's Circus is reproduced from the admirable report in the *Daily Post*, which rendered the cause inestimable service in the contest.

the rainbow of promise. I had my reward for the tremendous strain of the contest, and felt, like the poet, "better fifty years of Europe than a cycle of Cathay." That same night I addressed the working-men's club amid equal enthusiasm, and next day found the Exchange packed with a dense mass, through which I had to thread my way to the Town Hall, and then to visit the Exchange News' Room, and address the commercial public among whom I had lived and laboured.

One effect of this election was to fix the eyes of the whole country on social reform. It was the chief political event of the time, so that the Press took unusual notice of it. Being the largest constituency in England, and one so notoriously Conservative, it showed that a programme of social reform was what the people wanted. It was clear that I got in with the aid of many Tory votes. It is, I believe, the only case in the last half century where the Liberal cause triumphed in Tory Liverpool. It was a huge advertisement for all kinds of social reforms. No election had ever been fought on these issues before, but now it became the fashion all over the country. I was continually asked to address meetings up and down the country on these topics, and candidates for Parliamentary honours addressed themselves to these questions in dead earnest. For several years Parliament was taken up with social legislation, and a harvest has been reaped which this election at least helped to ripen. All this I did not see at the time. The pressure was too great. I was like a man swimming for dear life. It was only long after the struggle was over that I saw how at the very nick of time I was enabled to say what was needed. All this may seem egotistical, but I cannot help stating what I believe to be the truth. I was but the mouthpiece of greater and better men, such as Alexander Balfour, the Rathbones, Lockhart, Patterson, Lundie and others, at whose feet I had sat, and whose lives had interlaced with mine. Few of us can claim to be original. Our mental stock is a compound of ingredients drawn from our social environment. We get ideas we can hardly tell how. The difference between minds is more in the power of assimilation than of origination. Some have a resisting medium: others a receptive. The one produces a fossil, Tory type: the other a progressive and reforming one. In pure politics I owed more to Mr. Gladstone than to all my teachers combined, but on social questions mainly to those noble men whose names I have given above.

I was entertained at a dinner at the Reform Club, Liverpool, soon after the contest, and had a further opportunity of developing my schemes of social reform. I put to the front on all these occasions and for several years after, both in and out of Parliament, the need of saving the children. I had found the hopelessness of lifting on a large scale the "submerged tenth," as General Booth calls it—the middle-aged drinkers and wastrels of both sexes who swarmed in all our large cities; and I felt that unless we could save the children we should have a never-ending succession of this social wreckage. Hence I advocated industrial training for the slum children, night schools—mainly technical—the abolition of street trading by children at night, the legal imposition on parents of responsibility for adequate food and clothing, the right of taking children wholly out of the care of abandoned parents, the boarding out or emigration of pauper children, and their separation from corrupt adults. I attacked the corrupt workhouse system of those days, which produced generation after generation of paupers, and, above all, the wholesale temptations to drunkenness which the State permitted to be set up at every street corner. At the time I entered Parliament very few children attended evening schools. The few that did so got nothing but verbal teaching. Our education system in those days was in the hands of verbal pedants, whose sole notion of instruction was accurate reading, writing, spelling and cyphering. The training of the hands or the eye was thought to be outside the purview of elementary education. I worked hard for years to show the need of manual as well as mental training, especially in evening schools. Only 30,000 children attended such schools in all England in those days: now there are nearly half a million, and every form of practical training for hand and eye is encouraged: but there is still room for great development. Though anticipating a little, I may say that for several years I introduced a Bill each session to render it compulsory on children leaving school at thirteen or earlier, to attend night schools for two years longer. I never succeeded in carrying it, but I got the unanimous assent of the House to a motion, in 1889, affirming the desirability of a general system of evening continuation schools.

CHAPTER XV

My First Session—Life in Parliament—The Bradlaugh Question—"Overstrain in Education"—Socialism in England—Effect of Parliamentary Life

PARLIAMENT met in February, 1883, and I took my seat, introduced by William Rathbone and Stephen Williamson, who had both given me their heartiest support in my election. I took a house prettily situated on Clapham Common, but found it was too far off. I did not then realize what late hours were kept, and how fatiguing was a drive of four miles after one or two o'clock in the morning!

My first impressions of the House were bewildering. I had been accustomed to the methodical despatch of business, and to punctuality and economy of time. I found the bitterest party feeling, incessant obstruction, and an utter waste of time. The Irish Nationalists were fighting the Government with the most ingenious methods of obstruction. The "Fourth Party," led by Lord Randolph Churchill, was still worse. In all my Parliamentary experience I never witnessed such unscrupulous methods as that party employed against Mr. Gladstone. On the debate on the address I heard Mr. Forster's terrible denunciation of Mr. Parnell as accessory to the awful crimes that then disgraced Ireland. He spoke from behind the Government Bench, above the gangway; and for two hours poured out from a sheaf of notes the most damnatory charges I ever heard made against a political leader. Forster was a man of rugged appearance; he had none of the graces of oratory, but he spoke in a tone of intense conviction which electrified the House, and sorely tried the patience of Mr. Gladstone. No one could help respecting Mr. Forster, but I remain of opinion that Mr. Gladstone was right in liberating Parnell from Kilmainham, and getting back to legality in the government of Ireland.

My first speech was on Irish emigration for the overcrowded districts in the west of Ireland, where a benevolent Quaker, Mr. Tuke, was assisting the starving population to cross the Atlantic. I followed soon after by seconding Sir Joseph Pease's motion against the opium trade. My friend, W. S. Caine, very kindly invited me to a dinner at the Devonshire Club, where eighty or ninety Liberal members met to commemorate the Liberal victory in Liverpool, and there I had a good opportunity of advocating social reform.

I was plunged into a new world, meeting numbers of men of "light and leading" whose names had long been familiar, but whose personality was not known to me. The pressure of "receptions," dinners, etc., and the late hours of Parliament were very trying. I generally arrived home about two a.m.; but as the session advanced and obstruction became more obstinate, it was often three and sometimes four a.m.; and I often came home in broad daylight in the summer time. This was the first session that the two grand committees were set up—one on Trade, and one on Law. I was put on the first, and have sat upon it for nineteen sessions, and have seen many valuable measures passed dealing with trade and industry. That session we had Mr. Chamberlain's Bankruptcy Bill before us, and encountered obstruction almost as bad as in the House of Commons. Two days a week I had to sit for four hours, say from twelve to four, on the Committee, and then usually to one or two a.m. in the House. I found the life very exhausting. I had an enormous correspondence from Liverpool. Whatever subject was before Parliament, some section of that great community was interested. The cleavages of opinion were more acute there than anywhere else in the Kingdom. We had 100,000 Catholic Irish, and perhaps nearly as many Protestant Orangemen. Each side attacked me if I seemed to favour the other. I was fortunate in securing the aid of my old friend, Samuel James Capper, as Parliamentary Secretary. He was well known in literary circles as the author of the letters on the Franco-German War that appeared in the *Times* when he carried relief from the Society of Friends to the starving peasantry of France.

The first great difficulty I encountered with my constituents arose about Mr. Bradlaugh. He had been elected again and again by Northampton as an avowed Free Thinker. He had offered to take the oath, but had been refused. He had tried to force his way into the House, but had been ejected with much

violence by the police. He again presented himself at the bar of the House and claimed admittance. The general view of the Liberal Party was that he was entitled to take his seat, yet intense repugnance was felt to his views, in which I concurred. Mr. Gladstone introduced a Bill permitting "affirmation" in place of an oath to those who had conscientious objections to swearing. His speech was magnificent—deeply religious in tone, but showing the hopelessness of keeping up religious tests any longer as a condition of entrance to Parliament. He convinced my judgement, and I voted for it, but thereby incurred the reprehension of some of my oldest friends. I felt the position very painful. The Bill was lost, and Mr. Bradlaugh was kept out for some years longer, and by that means was made an idol of the common people, and secured a huge circulation for his infidel papers. In fact nothing could have so well served his self-advertisement. The irony of the situation lay in the fact that when the Conservative party came back to power at the next election Mr. Bradlaugh was allowed to take his seat almost without protest, and for several years proved himself a really valuable member of Parliament, and especially earned the respect of the Conservative party, who found him a bulwark against Socialism!

This Parliament contained a great number of earnest social reformers, and two motions were carried which caused us great satisfaction. Mr. Stansfeld carried a resolution condemning the "Contagious Diseases Acts," which soon led to their abolition, and Sir Wilfrid Lawson carried a resolution in favour of Local Option, which remains unfulfilled to this day, and indeed seems much further off now than it did then! I also brought forward the question of "Overstrain" in our Elementary Schools, on the education estimates, moved by Mr. Mundella (with whom for many years I cordially co-operated). Those were the days of "payment by results." The unfortunate teacher was expected to pass each child at the same age and at the same grade, whether weak or strong, stupid or clever. School was a place of great drudgery to the teachers, who had to pull up the children of deficient intellect to the common standard, often working in a vile atmosphere without proper ventilation, as was the case in most of the old voluntary schools. Great numbers of them broke down in middle life. The case of the pupil teachers was worst of all. They had to teach nearly all day and work all the evening as well, and I came to know of many cruel cases of ruined health.

I laid these facts before the House and repeated them year after year till the great Committee on Education was appointed, which condemned the whole system of "payment by results," and recommended the German method of payment for regularity of attendance, guided by a report of an inspector on general efficiency. Immense improvement followed that report, and now payment is made by the "block grant" system, and this pushing and driving of dull scholars are almost at an end. Pupil teachers are also given much more time for self improvement, and it is hoped that in time they may be wholly dispensed with, as in Germany. When I was member for Liverpool it was my part to inspect several of the schools, and I usually came home exhausted by the foul atmosphere. The new board schools, and indeed the best voluntary schools as well, are palaces compared with those pestilential dens which we once had. I can scarcely express my sense of the educational improvements which I have witnessed since Mr. Forster's Act of 1870; yet so great is the progress of other nations that we remain much behind both Germany and the United States, a subject I shall advert to later on.

I attended another great meeting in Hengler's Circus in 1883, along with Mr. John Morley, who was then editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette* and a very popular writer on the radical side of politics. In some respects our opinions did not agree, but we both stood "under the umbrella" of our great leader, Mr. Gladstone. Yet Mr. Morley's first public act on entering Parliament was to criticize the Irish administration. He put himself apparently into opposition to Mr. Gladstone's Government, but in a very short time thereafter he was Mr. Gladstone's henchman in the great Home Rule controversy, and his Chief Secretary for Ireland! About the same time I wrote an article to the *Nineteenth Century* on Social Reform, and followed it up in after years by several articles in the *Contemporary*. These were afterwards re-published as pamphlets and widely circulated. I also became involved in controversy with Mr. Hyndman and the Socialists in London. They attacked me because I went a certain way in their direction, but not far enough. They advocated State ownership of all industrial property, which they styled "collectivism"—in fact, they dished up in English dress the theories of Karl Marx, Lassalle, and Louis Blanc. I attended some of their club meetings, especially a very large one in Hackney, where we argued this question the whole evening. If I am not mistaken my friend, John Burns, M.P.,

was then in their camp. Now there is no more practical and clear-headed member of Parliament! Nothing strikes me more than the decay of Socialism as a political force these last twenty years. Working-class London, especially the East End, was then simmering with it. All our large cities had Socialistic clubs. Some of their popular books, like Bellamy's *Looking Backward* in America, and *Merrie England* in this country, had an enormous circulation. What they called the "competitive system" was denounced as an invention of the Evil One, and "capitalism" was the *ne plus ultra* of wickedness! To slay these dragons they were willing to kill liberty itself and put all mankind under compulsory labour for the common good! I published some pamphlets in reply to their arguments [1] and for a long time used to get letters attacking me as a tyrannical plutocrat! With young and ardent spirits Socialism is often the outcome of generous altruism, but with men of brains and commonsense it passes at a later stage into the realm of practical social reform. The true means of combating these wild theories is to study the elevation of the masses by every lawful means, and offer the spectacle of progressive and sympathetic government by the people for the people. Socialism competes in vain with orderly and just government founded on the broad basis of freedom. It thrives, like malaria, in unhealthy swamps, where men are maddened by intolerable suffering. Moral sanitation is the remedy for the one, as medical sanitation is for the other. The true disinfectant is Christian charity carried into the realm of politics as well as practised by the individual. This is the doctrine I have sought to preach ever since I entered public life, and will hold to life's close.

A word or two of general reflection on the effect of entering Parliament: I was conscious of a change that passed over my mental constitution. Like most busy men I had lived and moved pretty much in one sphere of thought. When first plunged into a maelström of opposing opinions the effect was rather staggering. There come into the British Parliament types of almost every conceivable opinion. To bridge the chasm between Gladstone and Bradlaugh, between Forster and Parnell, between Lawson and Ashmead-Bartlett, was not easy! One thing you came to perceive—an able and resolute debater can always give a spurious show of truth to every proposition. You find that words can be twisted to mean anything, and that much human argument is

[1] See Appendix V. or two letters to M. H. Hyndman.

but a logomachy. You find also that bona fide and fundamental differences separate the various types of mankind, that honesty and good faith may co-exist with what you regard as preposterous opinions. You come to find that far more can be said in support of unpopular views than you once supposed, and that political truth for the most part lies in a true perspective rather than in abstract statement. In fact, you come increasingly to distrust abstract statements of principle, and ask the question continually: "How will it work out in practice?"

The British Parliament, and indeed every free legislature, is a wonderfully educating institution. No man can sit there for years and follow the debates without being a much wiser man, unless he is an absolute fool. No man can long sit there and be an extreme dogmatist, or can fail to perceive that political truth is many sided, and cannot be put into short verbal formulae. You distrust increasingly what Napoleon Buonaparte used to call "ideologues," and you hold most of your own opinions subject to reservations. It was the combination of these various qualities which made Mr. Gladstone such a wonderful Parliamentary leader. It caused him to be always growing, and exposed him to the charge of inconsistency. He was inconsistent in the sense that a growing mind will not see the phenomena of life at forty as at twenty, nor at sixty as at forty. Neither will a free assembly nor a free people. There will be constant progress without cataclysm or revolution—a kind of gradual evolution, tending on the whole towards more humane ideals of life, though broken or delayed by times of reaction. As I pen these words I feel strongly we are passing through one of those reactionary eras, and I contrast the Parliament that met in 1900 unfavourably with the earnest reforming Parliament of 1880–85.

One further reflection I would make: the true solid foundation of the power of Parliaments is the average commonsense of the majority. This can almost always be relied on when the facts of a case are known. Individuals of genius, but without commonsense, sometimes get into Parliament and run a meteoric course of brilliant fireworks, but they do not deeply influence that matter-of-fact assembly. The final court of appeal, as Lord Rosebery said in one of the finest of his speeches, is the solid good sense of the nation, and we can always rely on it in the British Senate, as in the American Congress, and indeed in all Anglo-Saxon legislatures. It is that average commonsense which, with an open Bible,

accounts for the widespread and wonderful prosperity of the English-speaking race, and the British Parliament is a true microcosm of the race, with its limitations, its insular egotism, its benevolent intentions, and its contempt for the opinions of foreigners.

Parliament sat late into the autumn of 1883 and passed the Corrupt Practices Act to put down bribery at elections, and an Agricultural Holdings Act. I did not get away till the last week in August, very exhausted, and was glad of the rest of Craigieburn till the early part of October, when I returned to Liverpool and had a busy winter.

CHAPTER XVI

Henry George and the Nationalization of the Land

I MUST now advert to an agitation which swept over the country about this time. The name of Henry George was well known in America as the author of a remarkable book called *Progress and Poverty*. He created a great movement in New York directed against private property in land, but it was in the old country that his doctrines found most disciples. I have never known so sudden an outburst of Socialistic feeling as occurred in 1883–84. *Progress and Poverty* became a sort of Bible with multitudes. George appeared to them a second Moses to lead the suffering Israel of the nineteenth century out of the Egyptian bondage of cruel land robbers! His book was the production of an enthusiast, with a certain tincture of truth. It was instinct with a fervent philanthropy, but utterly one-sided and Utopian. Some of the wildest outbursts of anarchy have arisen from similar causes. Who surmised at the time that Rousseau's *Social Contract* would end in the guillotine and the Reign of Terror? Nothing is more certain than that Henry George's theories could never have been put in practice without a bloody revolution. He held and taught that all private ownership of land was simple theft. The man who bought land with his hard earnings according to the laws of his country was to be dispossessed without compensation equally with the feudal lord. The five or six millions of peasant proprietors in France, and the many millions of freeholders in America were to be treated as robbers, as well as the great landlords in Great Britain. Most of our statesmen and leading publicists deemed this craze not worth their notice; they allowed it to grow till it became a real political danger. Most of our large borough constituencies became honeycombed with societies bound to vote for those only who could pledge themselves to vote for the nationalization of the land. Mr. George came over to this country and

made a royal progress such as Parnell made in Ireland. He was a consummate popular orator—I cannot forbear saying a most skilful sophist—and it was marvellous to see how many even of intelligent and religious people were smitten with his panacea for human suffering. According to him all poverty and suffering arose from the monopolizing of land by private owners. Abolish this and all would be well. His remedy was the remission of all taxation—even the duties on alcohol and tobacco—and the imposition of a single tax of 20s. in the pound on all rent derived from land! It is difficult to understand now what a wave of excitement he caused at that time. Liverpool felt its full force, and I saw that sooner or later I must address myself to the question as I was so much identified with social reform. So I carefully studied his writings in the recess that year, and resolved to call the Liberal Council of Liverpool together in the autumn of 1883 and lay my views before them.

I secured a large and attentive audience under the chairmanship of our veteran Liberal, Sir James Picton, and laid down certain propositions. One was that civilization never progressed far till security was given to the cultivator of the soil that he should reap the fruits of his labours, and that where the land was held in common by the tribe or community as in Ancient Britain and Ireland, or still by the Red Indians of North America or the Maoris of New Zealand, high cultivation was impossible. I tried to show that most of the present value of agricultural land in all old countries is truly the product of human labour, and comes from ages of improving, manuring, clearing and fencing, and just as much deserves the protection of the law as any form of manufacture. Probably at the present time the rent from agricultural land in the United Kingdom is not more than three per cent. or four per cent. on the capital sunk in farm buildings, roads, fences, and permanent improvements. All this was entirely ignored by Mr. George. He also ignored the effect of Free Trade in food, which constantly reduced the agricultural value and rent of land[1] in our

[1] Henry George on the Duke of Westminster: "Though his titles have been acquiesced in by generation after generation, to the landed estates of the Duke of Westminster the poorest child that is born in London to-day has as much right as his eldest son. Though the sovereign people of the State of New York consent to the landed possessions of the Astors, the puniest infant that comes wailing into the world in the squalidest room of the most miserable tenement house, becomes at that moment seized of an equal right with the millionaires. And it is robbed if the right is denied."

country. He argued as if the necessary effect of private ownership was to raise the value of land higher and higher as the population grew larger and the monopoly became more and more rigid. His theories did not agree with the facts of the case, but went directly in their teeth. I showed that whereas the rent of the United Kingdom in 1814 was forty-nine millions out of a total estimated national income of 250 millions or almost twenty per cent., it was now (1883) 69 millions out of a total income estimated by Giffen at 1,300 millions, or a little over five per cent., and probably half the rent was absorbed by estate charges and never reached the landlord's pocket. So if Mr. George's scheme of confiscating this property were carried out it would only add at most 1s. in the £1 to the income of the rest of the nation! Yet he told us this would put an end to all human poverty! Indeed, I heard him say to a huge meeting in St. James's Hall that if wealth were fairly distributed no person need work more than one hour a day! Whereat a man sitting beside me leaped up on his seat and waved his hat with many others in a delirium of excitement!

I readily grant there was one point where George was worthy of a hearing. I refer to the prodigious growth of ground rents in towns and of mining royalties. I have always held that the State should not have allowed absolute property in land needed for building or mining purposes. The richest estates in our country are largely the creation of unearned increment. The wastes around our great towns have grown into veritable Golcondas by the owners sitting tight and waiting till the stream of population had to overflow, and then demanding what ransom they chose to ask. I have always held, and still hold, that this form of property needs jealous oversight and many restrictions in the interest of the public. The laws of England were far too much framed in the interest of landholders in the past; it is with toil and difficulty that we can retrace our steps in the present, but it has been done already to some extent by the great increase of the death duties on real estate, and no doubt it will be carried further in the near future by additional taxation of ground values for the sake of municipal improvements, and especially the housing of the poor.

Mr. George's agitation, like many another, failed in what it sought to attain, but it had some valuable collateral results. It opened up the whole question of the moral basis of ground values, and the incidence of taxation upon them. It is now shorn of its confiscatory, and what I may call its immoral, teachings, and is

brought within the scope of fair and rational legislation. Such is usually the course of human progress. You cannot get a hearing for a good cause till some wild enthusiast gets hold of the popular ear and preaches a millennium if his panacea is adopted. This creates a current on which the ship of reform can be launched and something really useful attained, though a hundredfold less than the visionary anticipated. The statesman is the seer who perceives the occasion is ripe to extend the bounds of Freedom :—

> And statesmen at her Council met
> Who knew the seasons when to take
> Occasion by the hand and make
> The bounds of freedom wider yet :
>
> By shaping some august decree,
> Which kept her throne unshaken still,
> Broad based upon her people's will,
> And compassed by the inviolate sea.

My address in Liverpool was published in the *Contemporary* and afterwards circulated as a pamphlet. I met Henry George at various meetings in London and was challenged by him to a public discussion at the National Liberal Club. I accepted the challenge and for some hours we had a warm discussion. Each of us spoke four times, replying alternately to the arguments of the other. I have regretted ever since that we had not obtained a verbatim report. It seemed to me (but I may be partial) that Mr. George's sophistry was evident to most of the audience of trained politicians. We never met again. I doubt not my opponent was actuated by pure motives, and has indirectly done real good. I reproduce my address for future reference in the Appendix (VI.), as the question may come up some other time. In a few years after this it quite died out, and one never hears of it now; but it may be one of those dormant questions which hard times and national suffering may again quicken into life. No fallacy which appeals to human cupidity is ever finally disposed of, and each generation seems doomed to fight the battle over again.

CHAPTER XVII

The Session of 1884—Franchise Bill—Merchant Shipping Bill—Egypt—The Manchester Ship Canal

THE Session of 1884 was one of strange vicissitudes. Mr. Gladstone was then at the height of his power and popularity. In Scotland he was almost worshipped; yet by the aristocracy and upper classes in London he was hated and distrusted as no statesman has been in modern times. I was asked by him to second the address at the opening of Parliament. Mr. Arthur Elliott, son of the Earl of Minto, was to move it. We had an interesting interview with Mr. Gladstone at Downing Street, in which for an hour he fully explained the policy of the Government. We agreed that Mr. Elliott should deal with foreign policy, and I with domestic. I venture to give the report of my short speech in the Appendix (VII.), as it dealt with my special subject of social reform. I should add that we dined, the night before Parliament met, at the Ministerial banquet at Downing Street, where Mr. Gladstone read us the Queen's Speech. Lord Hartington, Sir William Harcourt and Mr. Chamberlain were in those days his leading henchmen in the House of Commons. Mr. Gladstone himself was rarely absent from the House, except at the dinner hour, but sat there from four p.m. till twelve or one at night, and sometimes later, following the debates with keenest interest and often taking part. At the age of seventy-five he showed as much vigour and alacrity as the youngest member.

The great measure of the Session was the extension of household suffrage to the counties, which had until then a rating franchise which practically excluded the agricultural labourer. Mr. Gladstone made a splendid speech, one and three-quarter hours long, which deeply impressed me. Of course it was foreseen that the Bill, if carried, would involve a redistribution of seats, and this excited the deepest repugnance of the House of Lords and the

old Tory Party. Liverpool, Manchester, Birmingham and Glasgow had in those days only three members apiece. Little boroughs of 2,000 or 3,000 electors returned two members apiece. It was clear that an entire redistribution of political power would follow. It was thought by many that it would almost extinguish the Conservative Party and lead to a wild Radical overturn of existing institutions, including the abolition of the House of Lords and possibly of the monarchy. *O mens caeca mortalium*! Who could foresee in those days that a huge Conservative reaction was near at hand, and that the large boroughs with their greatly-increased power would soon be captured by the Tories?

I should mention that at the opening of the Session our old and popular Speaker, Sir Henry Brand, resigned and was succeeded by Mr. (now Lord) Peel. Mr. Peel had been a silent member of the House, but he was known to possess much of the ability of his great father, and he fully justified Mr. Gladstone's choice. His speech on assuming the Chair was a masterpiece of style and expression. We at once felt that we had got a captain who would restore discipline to the House of Commons, which had almost become an unruly mob owing to wilful obstruction. Our previous Speaker had been too gentle and amiable, and the House had got out of hand. Mr. Peel held office during a most trying time, and when he retired in 1895 he carried with him the respect of the whole House, and left a much better state of things than he found.

Another notable event of that Session was the introduction by Mr. Chamberlain of the Merchant Shipping Bill—if I mistake not, in a speech of three and a half hours long! He impressed us with his enormous ability. One thing I noticed: he did not need to take a sip of water during that long delivery—a wonderful sign of physical strength and also of vocal power. This Bill was the outcome of Plimsoll's agitation. He had roused the country by harrowing tales of ships over-insured and sent out with rotten planks and bad equipment that they might founder. I fear there was some ground for this charge among a few scoundrels who infested the shipping trade, as they do every other. Chamberlain's Bill required that ship insurance should leave a small risk to the owner, so that the loss of the ship should not bring him profit—a perfectly fair provision. It excited great repugnance among shipowners generally. Many of them were high-minded men, and resented the implied slight on their honour. They refused to believe in the piratical ship sinkers. I experienced in my

constituency much opposition to Chamberlain's Bill. It, however, did not pass into law; but various Acts since then have greatly increased the safety of the merchant service. The loss of life at sea is considerably reduced, and one hears no allegations now of over-insurance and ship sinking. Plimsoll's agitation accomplished its end largely by letting in light. I have always found that half the evil of a corrupt practice disappears when a public exposure is made. In a free country like ours public opinion prevails in the long run, and Parliament is quite as valuable in educating and focussing public opinion as it is in passing legislation.

During the Session Mr. Gladstone's Government experienced extraordinary difficulty with the affairs of Egypt. When the victory of Tel-el-Kebir in 1882 made us virtually masters of Lower Egypt it was not realized that we succeeded to a "damnosa hæreditas" in the Soudan. That vast region had been brought under the sway of the former Khedive very much by the genius of General Gordon, whom he had appointed Governor-General, with his seat at Khartoum. After Gordon resigned the post a Mahdi sprang up, claiming to be a prophet of God and a successor of Mahomet. He was acclaimed by the fanatical Arab population which rose in insurrection against the Egyptian Government. General Hicks and a few English officers led an Egyptian army into the trackless deserts that stretched to El Obeid, where they perished by sand-storms and attacks of wild Arabs. The whole of the Soudan became a seething mass of insurrection. A number of Egyptian garrisons were besieged, and urgent appeals were sent to our Government to relieve them. It was a task of Herculean difficulty. Khartoum was then almost inaccessible: vast waterless deserts cut it off from Lower Egypt. The Upper Nile—at least long stretches of it—was not navigable because of cataracts. The caravan route from Suakim on the Red Sea was blocked by hordes of Arabs under Osman Digna—a name of ill omen in those days!—besides being waterless and scorched with terrific heat. Our Government recommended the Khedive to give up the Soudan and negotiate for the relief of the garrisons. It was then thought beyond the power of Egypt to hold this vast region, and the Khedive very reluctantly assented. At this juncture General Gordon offered to go on a peaceful mission to Khartoum. He trusted in his personal influence, which was great, to relieve the garrisons. Indeed, I believe he stipulated with our Government not to use military force. He was an extraordinary man, a kind of modern Bayard,

a religious mystic, a blend between Cœur de Lion and Thomas à Kempis. He was backed up by Mr. Stead, then editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, and Mr. Gladstone somewhat unwillingly consented to his mission.

He managed to get to Khartoum, but found he could not compass his ends without force. He was besieged himself and applied for aid, and an expedition was sent up the Nile, piloted by Canadian boatmen, as far as water carriage was possible. Then a long march was made across the desert where a terrific onslaught of Arabs was repulsed. Again the smooth water of the Nile was reached, and half-a-dozen small steamers sent by Gordon were found waiting to take them to Khartoum. They arrived there just a day too late! The city had been stormed by the Mahdi's forces the day before. The gallant Gordon was slain and the garrison massacred. Our little band of heroes had to retrace their steps. It was like the retreat of the Ten Thousand! They had to fight their way step by step, and emerged from the desert with their commander dead and a long tale of killed and wounded. It was an exhibition of splendid but wasted heroism. The death of Gordon was a great blow to Mr. Gladstone's Government. It was accused of culpable neglect; some went so far as to call him the murderer of Gordon! Other attempts were vainly made from Suakim to rescue the garrisons in that quarter. Vast numbers of Arabs were slaughtered, but no practical end was attained. The final result was that the whole of the Soudan was given up to the Mahdi until it was recovered by Lord Kitchener, who with wonderful skill carried a railway to Khartoum and destroyed the Dervish power at Omdurman. So easy is it now to go to Khartoum that when our party was at Assouan last year we could have gone there in two days' journey as safely as we travel in England.

Tremendous attacks were made on the Government on account of their Egyptian policy, especially by Lord Randolph Churchill and the "Fourth Party," as this party of four free lances was humourously called. But Mr. Gladstone's large majority over both Conservatives and Irish Nationalists combined enabled him to push through the Franchise Bill and send it up to the Lords, where it was thrown out in the month of July. I was present in the Lords that night and heard the debate, which lasted to 1.30 a.m. I saw old Lord Shaftesbury, then over eighty, telling for the Bill after vainly exhorting the Peers to make a virtue of necessity. The House was crowded with spectators. It was felt to be a great

historic occasion. The excuse of the Tory leaders was that the new constituencies would be "gerrymandered" in the interest of the Radicals unless the Redistribution Bill was coupled with the Franchise Bill and both passed simultaneously. The action of the House of Lords caused a burst of resentment throughout the country. I witnessed a huge procession of London artisans 60,000 strong pass Westminster on their way to Hyde Park. The columns took two and a half hours to pass, marching in serried ranks like an army. I attended a great meeting in Hengler's Circus later in the year, to protest against the action of the Lords. It was seething with excitement. Violent speeches were made demanding the abolition of the Upper House. I also went to a great demonstration at Earlsham Junction, 6,000 or 8,000 present, presided over by Thomas (now Sir Thomas) Brocklebank, then a strong Liberal, now a Liberal Unionist. There strong resolutions were passed against the Lords. It almost looked as if the country were working up to something like a revolution. Chamberlain and Dilke vied with each other in heading the revolt against the Peers! Threats of violence were freely used. Birmingham talked of marching on London and Lord Salisbury talked of Chamberlain as of a budding Robespierre! All through the autumn the storm of agitation swept over the country. Business was rapidly wound up in Parliament. The House rose about the middle of August, and an autumn Session was announced, when the Franchise Bill would again be passed through the Commons and sent up to the Lords.

One more reminiscence of this Session I should give: Manchester had set its heart on being a seaport and wresting some of the carrying trade from Liverpool. There was commercial jealousy between these two cities. Liverpool dock charges and railway charges were considered excessive, and the scheme of a ship canal was dangled before Manchester and the surrounding towns as a great economy to trade. It became a kind of popular craze: the capital was subscribed and a Bill introduced into Parliament that summer. Part of the engineering plan was to cut a deep pathway through the upper tidal basin of the Mersey. Great opposition to this scheme arose in Liverpool. It was alleged that the alteration of the tidal estuary might diminish the scour of the tide which kept it from silting up, and that the port of Liverpool was threatened! At bottom great aversion was felt to what seemed an attack on the rights of our great seaport. The scheme was honestly believed to be a madcap adventure, certain to be

disastrous to the shareholders. I was asked to move its rejection in the House of Commons and did so unsuccessfully, for it was referred to a Committee of the House. Then began a long and arduous contest which went on Session after Session. I believe it went through six committees, three of each House—usually passed by one House and thrown out by the other! I attended many of the sittings of the committees as a spectator. The ablest engineers were retained on either side. Evidence was given by some that the works would ruin the navigation of the Mersey: by others that no harm would ensue! Much Parliamentary experience since then has taught me that you can always get "experts" to give diametrically opposite opinions, whether it be on a ship canal, or Parnell's handwriting, or any conceivable subject! One fact was impressed upon me by all the evidence I heard—that the canal would cost vastly more than the then estimates (it cost double), and that there was not the remotest chance it could pay the shareholders. It has been made, but only by an enormous loan from Manchester, which has imposed a heavy rate on that city. It seems very doubtful if the loan will ever be repaid, and the original shareholders have lost their capital. Yet the canal has conferred considerable advantages on Manchester. It has taken a good deal of direct trade from Liverpool, and has reduced both dock and railway charges. In the opinion of many it has justified the great expenditure; neither has it done any serious harm to Liverpool. The trade of that port has increased by leaps and bounds, and extension after extension has taken place in its vast dock estate, and still further great extensions are looming in the near future. Both cities can afford to shake hands over the ship canal, and admit that it was a great engineering feat which deserved and obtained a measure of success.

CHAPTER XVIII

Work for Children—"Barrack Schools"—Child Emigration

DURING my earlier Sessions of Parliament I had many invitations to speak on questions affecting pauper and destitute children. I addressed several meetings at Exeter Hall and the Mansion House this Session (1884) on such subjects as Child Emigration, Industrial Training, the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, etc. I was invited to visit several of the large district pauper schools and reformatories around London. I found several of them to be enormous institutions, containing 800 or 1,000 children each—in one case 1,500. Outwardly they seemed to be well managed. Everything went by clockwork; but there was no individuality in the training of the children. They were treated as machines, and were in some cases addressed not by name, but as number so and so! These huge "barrack schools," as they are now called, were enormously costly. In some of them the children cost £30 per annum, or even more if interest on the capital cost were charged, and the results were very poor. The mechanical artificial life unfitted them to stand alone. When the girls were sent out as domestic servants they usually lost their places from their entire ignorance of household work. They had never seen cooking done except in huge kitchen ranges by steam, and the vessels were generally made of metal. So they broke so much crockery that housewives could not endure them. Their tempers were soured and they had no knowledge of the use of money, having never possessed it. It was said that from always marching in rows the children could scarcely walk singly! Nothing had been done to draw out their affections, and their physical state was as unwholesome as their mental. Great numbers were suffering from ophthalmia and skin diseases. In some of these Institutions a large percentage had weakened eyesight. Some were almost blind,

and this wretched result was obtained by an expenditure three times as great as would have brought up a poor but respectable child in a working-class family!

All these evils had been exposed years before by Mrs. Nassau Senior in an able report[1] made to the Local Government Board, and some real improvement had taken place under the supervision of a committee of benevolent ladies called the Metropolitan Association for Befriending Young Servants. Still the inherent vices of the huge institutions could not be eradicated. Nature is against treating children as flocks of sheep. Nature, or rather the God of Nature, instituted the family, and nothing can supersede it with advantage. Where the State has to assume the care of orphans or deserted children the nearest approach to family life should be sought out. In Scotland for many years pauper children have been boarded out and sent to the village school with the children. Thus all trace of pauperism disappears. In England boarding out has never been popular, and the artificial life of institutions has carried the day with poor-law guardians. It was my work for several years, in and out of Parliament, by speeches and pamphlets to advocate the emigration of pauper children or their boarding out. But little impression has been made even to this day on the huge pauper schools. A committee was appointed some years ago to report on the metropolitan schools. It was presided over by Mr. Mundella. It condemned in the strongest terms the "barrack system." It showed that it was enormously expensive, most inefficient, and the sure means of perpetuating a pauper class. It proved that the children so reared regarded the workhouse or the pauper school as their home, and came back

[1] Extract from Mrs. Nassau Senior's Report: "It must not be forgotten that to girls brought up in the artificial surroundings of Government schools the entrance into life is far more trying than to a girl who has had natural training in a family and the experience of everyday life. It is difficult to realize how ignorant these girls are of things that are familiar to most children of a few years old. I hear it from the girls themselves, from their mistresses, from the matrons of Homes and Refuges, often even from the matrons who have done their best to train the girls in school. No artificial training, however careful, can teach a girl what she learns in family life without any apparent teaching at all. I have been told by mistresses that their own little girl of seven or eight is more handy, and can be better trusted to do an errand or make a small purchase than their servant of fifteen or sixteen from the workhouse school. I mention this to show that great patience is often needed on the part of the mistress if the girl is to turn out well: and it follows that the utmost trouble should be taken to find mistresses likely to train and instruct their little servants with intelligence and gentleness."

to it in after life, often with illegitimate offspring. It showed most plainly that we will never stamp out pauperism by segregating the pauper class from the rest of the community, and it pressed for the wholesome mingling of the State children with the rest of the community. An Association called the State Children's Society, presided over for some years by Lord Peel, now by Lord Crewe, was formed to press for these reforms. But the guardians cling to these institutions, and very little change has taken place. I cannot doubt that the difficulty largely comes from the existence of an official class whose living depends on keeping up these expensive institutions. They all work against any change in the system. The guardians are often men of parochial minds, with a narrow range of vision. There is a certain *éclat* to small tradesmen in the oversight of a huge building costing £100,000 or £200,000, with its dinners and gala days and public exhibitions of well-dressed children. There are also large contracts to be given out for food, clothing, etc. Gradually there grows up a kind of vested interest in this huge outlay, and no reform will ever come, so far as I can judge, from the working staffs, any more than the Licensed Victuallers' Association will diminish drinking. The lesson I draw is—beware of bureaucratic government: beware of a huge official class. They make common cause against all that lessens their importance. Human nature being what it is, self interest comes first. I gladly allow that there are many splendid and self-denying guardians who have followed the example of William Rathbone and William Crosfield in Liverpool. Immense help has been rendered by some high-minded ladies. Some of the worst abuses have been stopped by them. Still, the institution system at bottom is a bad one. I have listened to many discussions in the House of Commons. I have repeatedly shown the enormous advantages of emigration. The President of the Local Government Board always sympathizes and promises reforms, yet the *vis inertiae* stops all real progress.

I gave evidence before Mr. Mundella's Commission on Child Emigration. I showed that we could plant out in good Canadian homes any number of well-trained children from ten to fourteen years of age; that the farmers were eager to get them, treated them as their own children, and placed them at their own table; sent them to school and took them to Church on Sunday, and complied with every regulation we laid down, and gave them fair wages as soon as their labour was of any value. I showed that

ninety-five per cent. of our children turned out well; that only on the rarest occasions were any returned on our hands, and that we had a thorough system of inspection on a plan sanctioned by the Canadian Government. I also showed that the whole cost only came to £15 a child, including preparatory training, outfit, voyage and settlement in Canada, whereas the "barrack-school" system probably cost on the average £100 or £150 a child on an average residence of five years, and that a great number of those trained in institutions finally relapsed into pauper life. I explained that in rural Canada there is hardly any drinking—many districts are under prohibition—whereas in England these pauper children usually come of drinking dissolute parents. When they leave the pauper schools many are got hold of by their degraded relations and dragged back to the life of the slums. In rural Canada there is little temptation. The healthy life of the farm, the natural interest in poultry and pigs, in horses and cows, in plants and flowers, fill the child's thoughts, and the craving for unhealthy excitement dies out. If you take a thousand destitute orphan children and emigrate them through a kindly well-managed agency like Miss Macpherson's, Dr. Barnardo's, Mr. Quarrier's, or Mrs. Birt's, the cost will be £15,000. Probably 950 will become prosperous and settle in Canada. If brought up in huge pauper schools the cost will be £100,000 to £150,000. Probably not 800 will really turn out well, and the 200 will some day drift into the pauper class, with families large enough to replace the whole thousand! It is this wretched system of dealing with pauperism which has for so long made England behind other civilized nations in respect of its residuum.

I have set down here the results of many years' labour and observation on these questions, but I allow that it represents possibly the state of things in the eighties more accurately than it does that of to-day. Other questions have absorbed my time of late years. I became wearied with vain attempts in Parliament to rouse public opinion, and have not followed these subjects so closely as formerly. Those who wish for further information I refer to a speech in the Appendix (viii.), delivered July 2, 1899, which summarises the conclusions of Mr. Mundella's Commission.

I may add that the Canadian Government has properly laid down conditions to prevent abuse of child emigration. Some impostors have imposed on the public. Every good cause in England is clogged with a class of parasites, and it is quite necessary

that the greatest care should be taken that self interest be eliminated in this truly philanthropic work. The Canadians have a rooted aversion to "pauper children." They have had bad experience of workhouse training, and will not permit pauper children, strictly so called, to land; but those trained in institutes like the ones I have mentioned have no difficulty in getting placed. I believe I sent Dr. Barnardo his first subscription for emigration work. He has planted out over 12,000, and if these orphan and destitute children that are now sent to the pauper schools were entrusted from the first to the certified training homes for emigration, such as Dr. Barnardo's or Mrs. Birt's, and a reasonable grant was made to them, and no needless interference with their management was attempted, I have no doubt they would gradually drain away this supply of destitute children and convert them into thriving citizens of our Colonial Empire. The urgent need of Canada, and indeed of all our Colonies, is agricultural labour. They are all crying out for population. Canada has five to six millions of people, while six millions are crowded within the suburban area of London! Canada could feed 100 millions as easily as five or six millions. Is it not a shame that we should pour into our crowded cities, where the poor trample down one another in the struggle for bread, great numbers of children who are wards of the State, when we possess millions of square miles almost empty of population? The time will come when it will be considered a kind of idiocy to neglect such opportunities. I have visited the farmers' homes in Canada and seen the happy faces of our rescued children sitting at the same board as their adopted parents, and could not but contrast them with the thousands of shoeless, hatless, ragged, children I was so familiar with for so many years. I have done what in me lies by voice and pen to rouse the nation to see its own interest. So far as the poor law is concerned the result is disappointing; but so far as voluntary effort is concerned I have seen a great extension and development of child emigration. I would add in conclusion that nothing but the true philanthropy which is grounded on the love of God will make this system work well. It is a work for pious motherly women rather than for men. The children must be influenced by the heart rather than the head: they must, so to speak, be loved into obedience. The fatal defect of the poor-law system is the want of love. No system of rules will take its place. "Love is the fulfilling of the law." Those alone can train children well who love them, and

those alone should conduct emigration work who are moved by the highest of motives. It cannot be done as a department of State business; but the State should encourage and utilize those true philanthropists who, at great cost to themselves, have devised this splendid machinery to save the destitute orphan children of the slums.

One word more before parting with this subject: much of what I have said applies to orphanages and other institutions maintained by private means. Though their management is much better than the poor-law schools, it is still quite inferior to family life. I would urge that even with them the boarding-out system well superintended is much better. Or if that cannot be done, then the system of cottage homes, with a house mother for every twelve children, as in Dr. Barnardo's model village at Ilford, Essex. Anything is better than rearing children in swarms where individuality is lost.

CHAPTER XIX

Autumn Session, 1884—Depression in Trade—Trip to Rome—Banquet to Lord Rosebery

I HAVE already referred to the violent agitation against the Peers for their defeat of the Franchise Bill. Mr. Gladstone in the autumn made a triumphal progress through Scotland and addressed two huge meetings in the Edinburgh Corn Market. I was present at one of these meetings. The old man eloquent (who had been staying at Dalmeny) came in with Lady Rosebery on his arm, while Lord Rosebery brought in Mrs. Gladstone. Mr. Gladstone rivetted the vast audience for two hours. His sonorous voice penetrated every corner of the great building. At that time Scotland was at the feet of Mr. Gladstone. The Tory Party was almost extinguished. Wherever he went he was acclaimed with tumult of applause. Crowds beset the railway stations as he passed, and almost blocked the traffic. He bore upon his wrinkled face the deep lines of toil and anxiety. Yet he had a lion-like expression which bespoke invincible courage. Everything seemed to portend a constitutional crisis when Parliament reassembled at the end of October. Seldom have I seen so dramatic a denouement. We met towards the end of October and the stormy ocean soon sunk into a calm.

> Sic ait ; et dicto citius tumida aequora placat,
> Collectasque fugat nubes solemque reducit.

Mr. Gladstone and the party leaders on both sides agreed to a conference in order to see whether a fair scheme of Redistribution could be arranged, and it was found that no insuperable difficulty existed. The lines of the Redistribution Bill for next Session were agreed upon. The Franchise Bill was again passed and sent up to the Lords, and it went through its last stage actually without a word of debate ! Parliament rose on December 6, and an im-

mense sense of relief was felt at the end of a crisis which threatened the peace of the country.

All through this period there was excessive commercial depression. Liverpool was full of unemployed and famishing workpeople; so were all the great commercial and manufacturing centres. The feature that impressed every one was the extraordinary decline in prices. I have already stated that the average fall from the high-water mark of 1873 to 1885–86 was about forty per cent. The effect of this was to make commercial transactions excessively unprofitable. Fluctuations in prices have always occurred and will always occur, and do no harm within moderate compass; but these great tidal changes upset all ordinary calculations. They work against the industrial capitalist who invests his money in plant which employs labour, and work in favour of the money-lender "who toils not, neither does he spin." Throughout Lancashire a great portion of the industrial employers were on the verge of bankruptcy and, as I have already explained, the agricultural interest was just as depressed. This ruinous state of things caused a vigorous examination of our monetary system. The view which we had advocated in the Liverpool Chamber several years before spread over the country. It came to be perceived that it was not as much a case of over-supply and cheapening of production which caused the fall as an appreciation of the gold standard by which prices were measured. Merchants could not help seeing that India and other silver-using countries had escaped this great fall. They also observed that just as silver fell, so prices in gold-using countries fell; in fact, that the real phenomenon was a rise in gold as measured either by silver or commodities in general. This view spread over America as strongly as here and led to a powerful movement to remonetize silver. Congress was obliged to respond to it by legislating for the coinage of a certain proportion of silver monthly. As this was done without any reference to other nations it did little to remedy the international difficulty, but only embarrassed the finances of America.

It was clearly seen by all intelligent bimetallists that nothing short of international action on a large scale could extricate the nations from this monetary entanglement. The nations of Europe would at one time have followed the lead of Great Britain if she had agreed to enter into a bimetallic union, but, as I have already explained, the intense prejudice in favour of the gold standard, the enormous influence of the banking interest in London, and

the ingrained conservatism of the English character shipwrecked all schemes of international bimetallism. Nevertheless, a great agitation sprang up, of which Manchester was the centre. The bulk of the community there adopted the bimetallic principle. I was often invited to go about the country and address meetings of business men. One of the most interesting we had in 1885 was with the Glasgow Chamber of Commerce, where Stephen Williamson, Sir George Campbell and I spoke in favour of international bimetallism. At a later period I also addressed Oxford University and had a large audience under the hospitable patronage of Sir William Anson, Warden of All Souls. The causes of depression were being constantly discussed in Parliament, and we had a great Commission appointed to examine into the causes, followed some time after by the gold and silver commission of Lord Herschell, of which more anon.

For the sake of clearness and continuity I have anticipated a little the course of events. At the beginning of 1885 I made my first visit to Rome, accompanied by my wife and son and an old friend. The first visit to the Eternal City is an event in one's life, and subsequent visits have only confirmed the belief that no city in the world compares with the mother city of Europe in abiding interest. The explorations were then in full force which have laid bare almost every spot known in early Roman history. It is not too much to say that the thousand years of Pagan Rome can now be photographed as accurately as the thousand years of Papal Rome. Where in the world is such a sketch of history laid bare as, I may say, to the naked eye? When we remember that most of what we are in Europe by language, literature, law and religion hails from Rome, what wonder that the ties which bind us to the seven-hilled city are sacred? The first view of the Colosseum by moonlight to lovers of history is an event of one's life. The arena, where thousands of martyrs heard the cry "The Christians to the lions," can never be forgotten. The spots where Caesar fell, where Cicero spoke, where St. Paul died, thrill the mind of every student. I know not which is the more interesting—the Rome of the Caesars or the Rome of the Papacy. Each represented a world empire. Who can doubt that the primacy of the Caesars suggested to the ambition of Hildebrand and his successors priestly supremacy still more vast and wonderful?[1] Our reforming ancestors doubted not that Papal Rome

[1] Pope Gregory VII (Hildebrand) said at his Roman Synod of 1080: "We

was the "Great Babylon" that reigned over the kings of the earth. Whether that be so or not there is no doubt that for the space of nearly 2,000 years world-wide dominion centred in that wonderful city. To my thinking no edifice is so imposing as St. Peter's. The Gothic cathedrals of Cologne, of Milan, Strasburg and York are, perhaps, finer architecturally, but for massive grandeur and richness of decoration St. Peter's comes first, though for the exquisite colouring of the marbles St. Paul's without the walls is unrivalled. But the wealth of history in Rome is endless. The Church of St. John Lateran and the Villa Borghese almost rival St. Peter's for richness of decoration. It is not difficult to see how the pride of ecclesiasticism centres in Rome. Never has the aesthetic taste been so gratified as here. The finest in art, in music, in architecture is impressed into the service of the proud priesthood who claim to be the delegates of God on earth. Who can wonder that numbers of tourists from Protestant lands are hypnotized by the magic of the rich ceremonial that passes before their eyes? Yet the fact remains that the people of Rome and the people of Italy are not with the Church. The Quirinal and the Vatican are in deadly antagonism. All that is strong and healthy in modern life goes with the Quirinal and resents the claim of the Pope to temporal power. There is no Catholic country where the Church has so little hold upon the people as in the land which "the Forged Decretals" handed over to Pope Sylvester. In no country is there more complete religious liberty or greater contempt for the anathemas launched against modern progress. It may be truly said that educated Italy has revolted from Rome, but, unhappily, too often to the deadly realm of unbelief.

There is a kind of enchantment in the Italian sky. No land touches so many chords of the human heart. Whether for beauty of scene, charm of clime, or wealth of art, or historic fame, no country equals it. No doubt, in antiquity, Egypt far surpasses it. Even in grandeur the temple of Karnak eclipses the Colosseum.

desire to show the world that we can give or take away at our will kingdoms, duchies, earldoms—in a word, the possessions of all men: for we can bind and loose" (*Mansi*, xx. 536). Pope Innocent III. taught: "That the Papal power is to the imperial and royal as the sun to the moon, which last has only a borrowed light, or the soul to the body, which exists not for itself, but only to be the slave of the soul, and that the two swords are a symbol of the ecclesiastical and secular power, both of which belong to the Pope, but he wields one himself and intrusts the other to princes to use at his behest and for the service of the Church" (De majorit et obid D. Ch. 6, 1, 33).

I have seen nothing that compares with the remains of ancient Thebes in the sense of vastness and hoary antiquity. But it lacks the charm of association. The age of Rameses II. is as far off from us as the time of the mammoth and the mastodon. The ideas of the Egypt of the Exodus have faded into space and seem like those of another planet. You grasp them as vainly as Aeneas did the shades beyond the Styx. You cannot fill up in flesh and blood the faint outlines of these shadowy dynasties of Pharaohs, whose mummies still look at you from the museum at Ghizeh; but the Scipios and Caesars of Rome are household words. The portraits of Plutarch, both Greek and Roman, are as real as Carlyle's Cromwell or Frederic the Great. Thrasymene and Cannae are as real to us as Waterloo or Sedan. That classic ground has been trodden by sages and heroes innumerable. I am of those who hail with joy the resurrection of modern Italy. I have rejoiced at its emancipation by Garibaldi and Cavour, and by its patriotic king, Victor Emmanuel I. I have mourned over its trials and difficulties these last few years, and rejoice that now it is surmounting them and drawing into closer friendship with France, its sister Latin nation, from which it should never have been alienated. This interjection may be pardoned to one who has often felt as Hannibal did :—

> When life in his bounding heart beat high
> As he looked on the plains of Italy.

On our way home through London we saw the wrecks caused by the dynamite explosions at Westminster. The end of the House of Commons was blown out, and the roof and painted window of Westminster Hall were greatly damaged. Public indignation was at boiling heat. These dynamite outrages, planned by Irish Americans, were occurring all over the country. For one or two Sessions Parliament met under constant dread of explosions. We never knew when a bomb might be thrown upon the floor of the House from the strangers' gallery. It is known that one of these fiends was once in the gallery with a dynamite bomb. I had great difficulty as a member about giving cards for the admission of strangers. We were requested to admit only those we knew personally. It was impossible for me, with 70,000 electors, to know a tenth part of the applicants that came to me in the lobby, and yet one dared not offend constituents by hinting a suspicion of their intentions. I found the situation very difficult. Every

parcel was examined at that time by searchers, but no precaution could prevent a desperado secreting a small dynamite bomb in his pocket. I have often thought it was of the mercy of God that some awful crime was not committed which would have left a legacy of hate like the Gunpowder Plot three centuries ago.

We gave a banquet to Lord Rosebery this winter at the Liverpool Reform Club, at which I took part. Even then he showed his strong Imperialist leanings, which were not those of the Liberal Party as led by Mr. Gladstone; but subsequent events proved that this brilliant statesman more truly gauged the temper of the nation than some of us then realized.

CHAPTER XX

7, Delahay Street—The Session of 1885—Defeat of the Government—The Criminal Law Amendment Act

BEFORE going up to London for the Session of 1885 I gave up my house at Clapham and took 7, Delahay Street, Westminster, a most convenient house, just five minutes' walk from the House of Commons. It was an historical mansion, having been built by James II. for the infamous Judge Jeffries, and was inhabited by him when he browbeat witnesses and made himself the minion of a heartless tyrant. It is a curious fact that this old picturesque mansion was full of secret cupboards and passages, as though to provide means of escape for its owner. The oak carving was much admired, and I regret that this relic of ancient London was pulled down some years ago, and the site looking into St. James's Park has lain vacant since then. We occupied it for nine years, and many M.P.'s will remember our impromptu gatherings, for I usually took home some members to dine, and many a Parliamentary debate was resumed there. Men of both parties met in kindly conference, and learned to know and esteem each other. One of the best traditions of English political life is that party differences do not hinder social intercourse as is too often the case in Continental Europe. This is one reason why compromise is of the essence of British politics. Each party knows the other well and has a measure of sympathy with its aims, and has no desire to annihilate it. It is well understood that the party of Progress and the party of Resistance are both needed, and that, like the two oars of a boat, they succeed in giving a steady and gradual motion to the Ship of State.

Several conferences on important subjects were held at 7, Delahay Street. Some dealt with matters of great importance to India. Indeed, in one of these (Child Marriages), the principles were laid down which afterwards commended themselves to the Government of India, and were passed into law. The great event of the Session of 1885 was the passage of the Redistribution Bill, which was

carried through the House with conspicuous ability by Sir Charles Dilke. That statesman was then at the zenith of his reputation. He was spoken of as the coming Liberal leader; but all the world knows how he fell from that pedestal, and how long and vainly he has striven by strenuous labour to regain the position he lost.

It was obvious that Mr. Gladstone's Government was rapidly losing authority in this Session. Nothing injured him more than the entanglements in Egypt and the Soudan. The death of Gordon early in this year was a great blow. The vicious attacks of the "Fourth Party," led by Lord Randolph Churchill, and the violent opposition of the Parnellites made legislation most difficult. We had many late sittings. I often came home as the day was breaking. Obstruction was rampant. The amended rules of procedure proved nugatory. New forms of obstruction were developed with extraordinary ingenuity, and the way was prepared for the unexpected catastrophe of June 8, when the Government was beaten on the budget (a small addition to the beer duty), by a majority of twelve, and its resignation followed. So little was this expected that sixty of our side were away unpaired, and when I arrived after dinner there was no apprehension of defeat. There was indeed no necessity to resign, but probably Cabinet dissensions had something to do with it, and a feeling that it was not possible to hold the party together much longer. I saw Lord Randolph and some of the young Tories stand upon their benches and wildly wave their hats. They had succeeded in overthrowing one of the strongest Governments that ever took office. "The stars in their courses fought against Sisera." A great many burning questions reached their climax under Gladstone's administration. I have omitted mentioning that one of them was a serious misunderstanding with Russia about the question of Afghanistan. It led to the Pendjeh incident, when a Russian army attacked and defeated the Afghans. For a time peace and war hung in the balance. Mr. Gladstone asked for a vote of eleven millions for military preparations. In reality most of this was intended to pay up arrears on the Soudan Campaign, but it was arranged so as to imply preparedness for ulterior developments. It may have had some effect on Russia. At all events the crisis passed away and an Anglo-Russian Commission was appointed to delimit the Afghan frontier, which has settled that question substantially till this day.

Lord Salisbury was asked to form a government, but at first declined. He was enormously outvoted by the Liberals and Irish Nationalists combined. Although the Irish had bitterly opposed Mr. Gladstone's Government there was little chance that they would work with the Conservatives, whose policy was coercion and opposition to Mr. Gladstone's agrarian legislation. For two or three weeks there was an interregnum. At last Lord Salisbury agreed to form a Provisional Government until the sense of the country could be taken in the autumn.

During the remainder of this Session great excitement was caused in London from a series of articles by Mr. W. T. Stead, Editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, revealing the existence of criminal vice so abhorrent as to startle and almost stupefy the public. I do not remember in my lifetime anything so shocking. The first feeling was indignation at the outrage on good taste and a prevalent disbelief of the truth of the charges; but soon a current of conviction grew up that there was at least a kernel of truth at the bottom of the disclosures. A small number of members, led by Samuel Morley — that true philanthropist — formed a committee of investigation and reported that there was a basis of truth. An irresistible demand was made in Parliament to intervene. The state of the law for the protection of young girls was barbarous. It was held that a child of thirteen was competent to consent to her own dishonour! A Bill had been before Parliament for years to amend this, but it could not get through in the teeth of the determined opposition of a few unscrupulous men. The object of Mr. Stead's revelations was to fill the sails with a breeze which would carry it into law. It certainly succeeded. The breeze became a gale, and the gale a storm. Sir Richard Cross, the Home Secretary (now Lord Cross), did his part very well. A few of us banded together and arranged to sit up night after night till we carried it. We had the violent opposition of a handful of men who seemed to think that the raising of the "age of consent" from thirteen to sixteen was a violation of Magna Charta! For three nights we sat up to three a.m., and carried the measure. It for the first time provided a weapon sharp enough to punish the betrayers of young girls and to break up the horrible business of trafficking in female dishonour. A regular trade then existed between England and the Continent, in which innocent and ignorant girls and young women were bought and sold like sheep for purposes too terrible to mention.

The agents engaged in this "white slave trade" were well known to the police, but so lax were our laws and those of other countries that practically no interference with it was possible. The Criminal Law Amendment Act passed this Session gave at last a heavy blow to this system. It was not perfect. Some regrettable omissions were made which have still to be remedied, but it paved the way for better legislation all over Europe. No one did more to lead this holy crusade than Mrs. Josephine Butler, and her name, and that of Mrs. Booth, of the Salvation Army, will go down to history as heroines of the nineteenth century. Our chief supporters in the House of Commons were Samuel Morley, Professor James Stuart, Sir Robert Reid, and out of Parliament, Mr. Stead, Percy Bunting, Editor of the *Contemporary Review*, and Benjamin Waugh, the well-known secretary of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children. We were in constant consultation with them during the progress of the debates. I succeeded in carrying an amendment permitting the evidence of young children to be given without taking an oath, which has made it easier to get convictions ever since. I may say it was long before the magistracy and police availed themselves of the full powers given them by the Criminal Law Amendment Act. It is only in the last few years that several of the northern towns have put the law fully into force. But the effect has been marvellous where they have had courage, as in Glasgow, Sheffield, Cardiff and other cities. Indeed, in Liverpool and Manchester the state of the streets is entirely changed from what I can recollect them to have been. The moral sense of the community insists upon a measure of decorum which was unknown at one time. I cannot doubt that multitudes have been saved, from the absence of temptation, who formerly would have fallen; but the unhappy fact remains that the metropolis itself was the last city in the Empire to take effective means to improve its moral condition. Its condition has, I think, been steadily getting worse, till at last a movement has sprung up which I trust will bring it into line with the reforming tendency of our northern cities.

During this Session I also had an opportunity of securing an excellent discussion upon a motion for the industrial training of destitute children.

We got down on August 8 to our sweet country residence of Craigieburn and rested, in view of the election to come on later in the autumn, taking a short run into the Highlands in September.

CHAPTER XXI

Loss of Seat—Second Visit to India

LIVERPOOL obtained nine members under the Redistribution Act. The city was divided into nine Parliamentary wards, and the great honour that belonged to a seat for the whole borough disappeared. I have observed with all the great cities the same decline in the interest of these elections since the ward system was adopted. Great commercial and manufacturing towns have each a brain and nervous centre, and a real unity of organic life. You cannot cut them into separate organisms without a kind of atrophy. Manchester has never spoken as it did when Cobden and Bright represented it, or Edinburgh as when Macaulay, or Liverpool as when Canning and Huskisson. Yet the division was unavoidable, for the numerical basis is the only fair one in a democracy. I was chosen to stand for the Abercromby division, whose able chairman was John Lovell, the editor of the *Mercury*. During October and November I was repeatedly asked to speak at meetings for the other Liberal candidates. One of them was Augustine Birrell, whose remarkable abilities were then first publicly displayed, but without success. The chief feature of the election was the determined effort of Parnell to gain the Irish votes for the Tory candidates. Not that he loved the Conservative Party: far from it, but he saw that by turning the scale in constituencies like Liverpool, where the Irish element was strong, he would produce a balance between the two Parties which would make him the umpire of their fate. The effect in Liverpool was surprising. When the election took place near the end of November I lost by 807 votes, as did all the other Liberal candidates by even greater majorities. The Tories captured all the Liverpool seats except the Scotland Division (the Irish quarter), which has been held by a Home Ruler, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, ever since. Not a Liberal has sat for Liverpool since then, except for a short time in the Exchange Division. In Manchester the Liberals only secured one seat, and many of our

BELLAGIO

Photo by Photochrom Co

best members were thrown out, so that Parnell became the arbiter of parties next Session.

Thus my brief Parliamentary career in Liverpool came to an end. It is one of the disadvantages of political life that you are liable to sudden bouleversements. After rearranging your business and domestic life to suit the new conditions you are liable to have all your plans upset and perhaps broken beyond repair. So it was with me. I had intended to give my life to Liverpool. I had prospered there, found my sphere of work there, and contemplated remaining there while life and health lasted. Its representation in Parliament seemed likely to rivet the ties which bound me to it. But now I was suddenly cast adrift and soon found myself anchored in a different clime, where I had in a Parliamentary sense to learn a new language, take up new quarters and undergo a kind of transmigration. The pressure of a county constituency in Wales for sixteen years, added to my life in London and a home in Scotland, left less and less time to the work of Liverpool. As life went on and strength grew less I felt increasing inability to live three separate lives—a Liverpool life, a Welsh life and a London life. I tried to carry it on longer than I had strength for, and the result was a premature breakdown.

It was a disappointment to sever the political ties that bound me to Liverpool, but the brief respite I obtained was of great value. I at once decided to revisit India and study the problems of our great Dependency. I had felt a deep interest in that great country since my travels in 1862-63, and gladly embraced this opportunity of studying the problems afresh from a wider standpoint. Another reason influenced me. My dear wife had not been so strong of late: our changeful life pressed heavily on her. I wished to give her some respite. I was also in much need of rest, and so we promptly decided to go to India, with the view of perhaps extending the trip to Australia, Japan and Canada, and to travel most of a year. Shortly before Christmas, 1885, we started, a party of six—my son and his companion, a tutor and a travelling maid. A number of our friends gave us a most kindly send off. I treasure these friendships as a precious heirloom. I had spent the thirty best years of my life in Liverpool, and many of the dear friends who then bade us goodbye have since gone to that bourne from which no traveller returns, and of our inner party of four I alone am left here below. "Sunt lachrymae rerum, et mentem mortalia tangunt."

As soon as we reached London I found telegrams informing me of a vacancy in Scotland and asking me if I would offer myself for the seat. I declined, as I did not wish to break our plans. An eminent member of Mr. Gladstone's late Government got the seat. We travelled by the St. Gothard tunnel to catch the P. and O. steamer at Venice, halting for a few days at Lugano to visit some old friends. The hills were white with snow: the scenery was exquisite. One day we climbed Monte Bré and had a splendid view of the Alpine chain. I had formerly climbed Monte Salvatore, on the opposite side, and saw that fair landscape in the height of summer. I do not think any Swiss or Italian landscapes surpass those, unless it be that from Monte Generoso, a few miles beyond Lugano. Como is the finest of the Italian lakes, though Maggiore runs it hard. Bellagio is perhaps the loveliest spot in Europe, but in some ways Lugano especially appeals to me. The views from the rising ground behind the town embrace the whole chain of the Alps, of which Monte Rosa is the monarch, while the smiling lake, locked between wooded hills, fills the foreground. Peaceful villages with vineyards and olive groves nestle along the hillsides; little boats with lateen sails speed over the waters; you hear at a distance the songs of the boatmen. An aspect of tranquil contentment pervades the scene. No wonder that the Northern barbarians gazed with rapture on the sunny plains of Italy! Often when descending from Alpine passes I have felt the magic of this fairy land. If Athens was the eye of Greece, Italy is the eye of Europe.

A brief visit to Venice revived the memories of bygone trips made in the mellow autumn. Next to Rome no Italian city thrills the traveller like this enchanting daughter of the sea. Who has not felt the spell which Byron has thrown round it?

> I stood in Venice on the Bridge of Sighs,
> A palace and a prison on each hand:
> I saw from out the wave her structure rise
> As from the stroke of the enchanter's wand;
> A thousand years their cloudy wings expand
> Around me, and a dying glory smiles
> O'er the far times, when many a subject land
> Looked to the winged lion's marble piles,
> Where Venice sate in state, thron'd on her hundred isles!

Who can ever forget the palace, and church, and square of St. Mark, the Grand Canal, its ancient palaces, the song of the gon-

BRIDGE OF SIGHS, VENICE

Photo by Frith & Co., Ltd

doliers, the soft evening light along the Lido, as your gondola takes you to the Armenian convent? And who has not admired the wealth of art created by Titian, Paul Veronese and Canaletto? The Byzantine style of Venice reminds one of its close connexion with the Orient, when once for a short time its "winged lion" flew over Constantinople, and when for centuries it was the bulwark of Europe against the Turks. What strikes the traveller in Italy beyond all other lands is the individuality of its cities. Each has its own character, its art, its architecture, giving it the air of a small republic, as indeed most of these cities were in the Middle Ages. Hence Rome, Naples and Florence, Milan, Bologna and Perugia, Venice and Verona, Genoa and Pisa are each a creation of human genius, distinctly marked off by many centuries of independent life. In some respects the mediaeval cities of Germany partake of this character, but are far inferior in beauty to classic Italy; whereas our Anglo-Saxon cities, alike in Great Britain and her daughter nations, pay homage to no grace except utility. I think it is the intense contrast between the restless utilitarian life of Britain and America and the aesthetic life of Italy which draws so many of us there. It supplies a cushion for the overwrought brain and a delightful interlude amid the ceaseless grinding of the wheels of life.

We sailed from Venice by the *Gwalior* for Bombay, and had a good voyage to Alexandria. We made the acquaintance on board ship of that great engineer, Sir John Fowler, who had done so much for Egypt. We spent a very pleasant week in Cairo, meeting our leading officials, such as Sir Drummond Wolff—then on a special embassage—and the great water engineer, Sir Colin Scott Moncrieff, who repaired the barrage of the Nile and thereby added greatly to the cultivated area of Lower Egypt, just as the great dam at Assouan, made by Sir John Aird, which I visited in 1901, will add to the cultivation of Upper Egypt. We climbed the Great Pyramid and visited the chief remains of antiquity around Cairo. We rejoined our steamer at Suez, meeting some interesting Anglo-Indians, with whom I had much converse on our charming sail across the Indian Ocean. I know of no more delightful climatic effect than a sail across the Indian Ocean in the period between the monsoons. It is almost always calm and equable; the portholes are kept open and the air is delicious. Even the Red Sea is equable from December to May, though after that it becomes very hot, and in the autumn months is almost dangerous. I read

little on my way out but Indian literature, such as the *Life of Lo Lawrence*, who may truly be called the saviour of India. But f his daring genius in arming the Sikhs and sending them to Del to fight the mutineers it is very doubtful if the British Raj cou have been maintained. I read Mr. Digby's book on the pover of India, which has recently been followed up by an even mo terrible indictment (considerably overstated, I hope); also th remarkable articles by Seymour Keay which had appeared in th *Nineteenth Century* on "The Spoliation of India." He was als a fellow passenger. My object was to hear all that could be sa on Indian problems from every point of view; and when we reache Bombay towards the end of the month I at once placed myse alongside all the leaders of opinion, both native and Europea both official and non-official. I met some very interesting peop at Government House, such as Henry Gladstone, just returne from Hawarden, from whom I gathered that his father had espouse the cause of Irish Home Rule; also that remarkable man, Gener Phayre, somewhat of the style of General Gordon. I had lon and interesting conferences with the Hon. M. Telang, native judg and member of the Legislative Council, with my old friend Dadabh Naoroji, and Sir Wm. Wedderburn, with whom I afterwards worke for several years in Parliament, and a truer friend of the India ryot I never knew. I also met the heads of the various Christia missions and had a most interesting conference with a numb of leading Indian gentlemen connected with the Congress movemen

A marvellous change had come over Bombay since I was the before. It was then an old fort surrounded by a moat and ram part: now it was a spacious and beautiful city with fine enviro and noble public buildings, the work of Sir Bartle Frere and h successors. It had also become a great manufacturing centr The two or three cotton mills of 1863 had grown to about seventy and now I suppose they have nearly doubled again; and I doub if anywhere in Lancashire except Oldham is more cotton spu and worked up than in Bombay! Indeed, in the sense of a grea centre of trade and energy of all kinds Bombay is the true capit of India. In situation it far surpasses Calcutta and Madras. Th scenery of the fine harbour is like that of a great Highland loch, an not much inferior to the bay of Naples.

We received much kindness in Bombay. Lord Reay was the governor, but in poor health, and his lady did the honours of Go vernment House with much grace. We planned a trip throug

BERNESE ALPS : VIEW FROM PILATUS

Photo by Photochrom Co

the north-west provinces during the cool season. We visited the splendid monuments of the great Mogul Empire at Delhi and Agra, and I do not know any tour of more surpassing interest or a more exhilarating climate in the months of December, January and February. Indeed, there are times when in North India the cold is much more troublesome than the heat, though it is true that the midday sun is always dangerous to a European, and needs the shelter of a sun helmet or a white umbrella.

It may interest those to whom India is new to read some extracts from letters I wrote home, and which I subjoin; but those who are familiar with the scenes can pass them over. There were few travellers in those days. Now it is becoming part of the grand tour which every educated gentleman thinks he should make! These letters deal more with the pictorial than the political side of Indian life, and I reserve till a little later my reflections on the more serious questions which I went to study in India. I would only mention here that at every point we met the ablest representatives of European and native opinion, and had several conferences in the evening with the leading reformers among the Hindoos and Mohammedans, where every problem was discussed with the utmost freedom, but with unfailing courtesy. I was struck with the excellent English spoken by many of the natives; indeed, a purer and more literary form than we are accustomed to at home, just as the finest Latin and Greek scholars copy the language of Cicero and Demosthenes rather than the debased scholasticism of a later time.

We travelled by way of Ahmedabad and Jeypore to Delhi, spending a little time at Jeypore. A wonderfully enlightened Rajah has made it one of the most progressive cities in India.

DELHI,

Tuesday, February 9, 1886.

We left Jeypore on Monday at noon. We have a most pleasant remembrance of our visit to that very interesting place; all was so bright and beautiful; indeed, the weather was perfect. We travelled yesterday by rail through a flat country, with here and there hills skirting the horizon.

We reached Delhi at 8 p.m. and put up at the Northbrook Hotel. It is impossible to describe it; the rooms consist of little but interminable rows of doors. The bedroom I write in rejoices in 14 doors, many of which I have not ventured to open, feeling a sort of awe lest something should happen to me akin to the fate of Blue Beard's wife, if I profanely try to force them open.

The ladies are in the drawingroom just now, which resembles a crowded bazaar, as each night after dinner a throng of pedlars invade it with jewellery, embroidered cloths, shawls and other kinds of Delhi work.

But to resume our journey. We had a good night's sleep here, and had a drive before breakfast at 10 a.m. People here usually take an early cup of tea, say at 7 a.m. and then a solid breakfast at 10. Our complaint is that we can get little except butcher's meat to all our meals. They have generally four or five kinds of tough meat, and very few vegetables; it is a great mistake feeding people this way in a hot climate. Well, after breakfast we took a carriage and a guide, and sallied off in quest of adventures. We first took a general drive through the town. It stands close to the river Jumna, the chief feeder of the Ganges, which at this season is quite low, and is completely surrounded by a high wall, built by the Emperor Shah Jehan, the founder of this city 250 years ago. Behind this wall the mutinous Sepoys, some 40,000 in number, defied the little British army encamped outside the town for four months. The attacking force was only 9,000 men, but they effected a breach in the wall and forced their way in, and took the city after three days' fighting from street to street, with the loss of one-third of the attacking column. It was one of the greatest feats of arms on record. The city swarms with people. You make your way with difficulty through the crowded streets, the syce or postillion attends your carriage screaming at the top of his voice to prevent people being run over. We first visited the old Fort, where the Palace of Shah Jehan stood. The finest part of it is preserved, and looks as fresh as when built 250 years ago; it is of white marble, beautifully inlaid with precious stones. We were surprised at the beauty of the carving and workmanship; it was just one vast and exquisite picture, but on looking closely you could see where the richest stones had been picked out by the Sikh soldiers at the sack of Delhi. The holes have been partly filled up with sealing wax at the cost of the Government, but it has not the same effect as the brilliant cornelian stones. In the centre of this Palace there stood at one time the famous "Peacock Throne" of the Mogul Emperors; the jewellery upon it was valued at 3 millions sterling. It was carried off by the Persian invader Nadir Shah, who sacked Delhi in the middle of the 18th century.

All about this city reminds you that it was the seat of a mighty empire for many hundreds of years; from about the twelfth century onwards the Mohammedans ruled in Delhi, and most of India became subject to them. About half the people here are Mohammedans, and they must feel mortified at their position now. It was curious to see the red coats inside the ancient Fort. There are splendid barracks built for them, but they are very unhealthy. I spoke to some of the soldiers and was sorry to find so many invalids there. They say that the water is bad and that malaria comes from the Jumna. Many were suffering from sickness or accidents, dating from the great review held here a short time ago. The weather was very

AMBER CASTLE, JEYPORE

Photo by Photochrom Co

bad and the troops got drenched, and their tents were flooded with water. I felt sorry for the poor fellows. It requires careful management to keep British troops in health on the plains of India. We called in the afternoon on Mr. McNabb, the Chief Commissioner here, and he showed us in his garden the site of the batteries that breached the walls of Delhi; his own house was occupied by the mutineers, but they were surprised and killed by the British forces, and then his house was used for the attacking force. After this we visited the famous Jami Musjid Mosque; it is a huge building. In the vast courtyard in its centre sometimes assemble 40,000 Mussulmans to say their prayers. It is very striking to see the attention Mohammedans pay to their religion; they say their prayers publicly seven times a day, and do not mind who may be present. Our guide prostrated himself on the ground, and kissed it several times, reciting verses from the Koran, and looking towards Mecca. We went up one of the two tall minarets of the Mosque, and had a fine view of the whole city. It looks very imposing, but the country is a dead level plain as far as the eye can reach.

After this we visited the Baptist Mission here; they have fine large premises.

The air here is cool and bracing, about 55° at night and 70° to 75° in the day time. We never enjoyed more delicious weather than we have had in India.

Thursday, February 11.

I now continue our narrative. Yesterday morning, when we got up, we found a very cold wind blowing; it made one shiver on stepping out, and the natives looked half frozen in their thin cotton garments. Many of them are not half covered; some have only a strip round the middle: many of the little children are stark naked. It is a mystery to me how they live in such weather; our guide says that many of them die of cold. I was glad to wear two top coats at once when driving early and late. The sun warmed the air during the day, but the wind, which comes from the snowy ridges of Afghanistan, is always cold. I never felt more bracing weather; it is splendid for toning one up. After breakfast we started for a long day's journey. We passed through a country studded with old buildings, belonging to ages anterior to the present city of Delhi, which is only 250 years old. It was the custom of Eastern monarchs often to choose a new site for a city, and Delhi has occupied several sites at various times during the past thousand years, and the country for 10 or 15 miles round is covered with ruins. There still survive many large mausoleums, or tombs, built for the Kings or Prime Ministers; they look like Mosques, having large domes, with courtyards in the centre, and often accommodation enough for scores of persons to sleep at night. We visited some, whose names I need not trouble you with; all are Mohammedan, showing that the native Hindoos have long been a subject race. The last Hindoo King was crowned in A.D. 1193, and the Mohammedans ruled over this part of India till they were sub-

verted by the British. On the way we passed the remains of a huge Observatory, built by the Rajah of Jeypore, who was a famous astronomer. Our road was bordered by large crops of wheat, which form the chief cold-weather crop round Delhi. It is sown in October: reaped in April; then come the rains in June, when other crops are sown, and reaped in September or October. Wheat is becoming an enormous article of export from India. The crops are very good this year.

The main object of our journey was to see the famous pillar or column of Kutub Minar, said to be the largest in the world. It stands 11 miles from Delhi, in the midst of the broken arches and finely-carved pillars of old Temples which are scattered profusely all over the ground. It is a remarkable object. The shape is very elegant, and its dimensions are imposing. It rises 240 feet high, thick at the base, and gently tapering to the top. The sides are beautifully fluted, and a circular stair inside takes you easily to the top, from which you have a splendid view of the surrounding country. I felt much impressed by the historical associations. On all sides are seen ruined cities, memorials of vanished empires. One is struck by the great scale on which history has been enacted here; evidently there have been powerful monarchs and great nations, whose magnificence is attested by the wonderful remains of these landmarks. The ruins almost surpass those of ancient Rome.

This great column (the Kutub) is 700 years old, but looks as fresh as if built yesterday. Its proportions are as graceful as can be seen anywhere in the world, and show what knowledge of architecture these people must have had when we were little better than savages. We drove from the Kutub to see the ruins of an ancient city called Tugluckabad; it was built by the freak of a despot some centuries ago, and was only occupied for a few years. The walls which surround it are gigantic and well preserved: they extend for several miles. They seem to have been from 60 to 80 feet high, and enormously thick. Compared with them castles like Warwick or Kenilworth appear mere toys!

We then drove home in the late evening, passing droves of bullock carts, with the wearied peasants half asleep. These large country carts are generally drawn by four bullocks; some of them are splendid animals, very large and handsome, and with such a gentle expressive face, but many are evidently underfed, with sharp projecting bones. Nearly all the work here is done by bullocks, though a good many camels and asses are also used. We dined in the evening with the Chief Commissioner of Delhi. His house is a large building, called Ludlow Castle, a few hundred yards outside the walls. It was occupied by the mutineers as an advanced post, but was surprised by the British early in the morning, and all the guard were killed; then it was used as an outpost of the British army, and the cannon that breached the walls were planted in the garden. We saw tablets to commemorate the event.

The following forenoon we went over the ground famous in the

MOTEE MUSJID, DELHI

Photo by Frith & Co., Ltd

siege. We visited the Kashmere Gate, which was blown in by a little party, most of whom were killed on the spot, and through which the attacking column entered and stormed the city. It took six days' fighting in the streets to drive the mutineers out of the town. The total British force never exceeded 10,000 men, and they lost 3,800 in the course of the siege. Our guide gave us a vivid picture of the terrible scenes enacted at the time. He showed where 3,000 of the mutineers were slain ; it was a life and death struggle, and no quarter was given on either side. It is wonderful to see everything so quiet now. Our guide told us that many of the old mutineers are now in the service of the Government, but they keep very quiet about the past.

We went over the rising ground called the " Ridge," two miles outside the town, where our army encamped during the four months the siege lasted. There is a beautiful monument erected there to the memory of the fallen.

In the afternoon we visited different scenes. We drove some miles out of Delhi to see the famous Mausoleum of the Emperor Humayoun, passing on the way another ruined city, with gigantic walls, called the Pathan Fort. The Tomb or Mausoleum of Humayoun is the finest we have yet seen. It is an immense structure, almost as big as a Cathedral, raised upon a huge platform of brick ; the sides of it are beautifully carved. It abounds in marble and red sandstone screens pierced in the most exquisite style. The labour bestowed is beyond belief. Such works can only be done in an age when despotic power can command an unlimited amount of forced labour.

After this we went on a little further to visit quite a cluster of tombs, also adorned with this exquisite marble work. The tombs were very much smaller, but the walls were composed of this delicate marble tracery, which looks like Brussels lace. Strange to say these beautiful buildings are surrounded by poor mud cottages, inhabited by squalid-looking half-naked people ; but such contrasts are quite common in India.

While we were so engaged, the ladies were very differently occupied. The Baptist Zenana Missionaries here had arranged a Durbar, or reception for native ladies, in the afternoon at the Mission House ; and Mrs. S. and Miss J. were invited. It was a great event here, for the richer classes in India never allow their ladies to appear in public. They are kept constantly shut up in the women's apartments, and when they go abroad they are curtained off, so that they cannot see, or be seen. They however persuaded a number of natives ladies to attend, on condition that the Mission House should be curtained off, and no male visitors allowed on the premises. About 100 attended, some of them richly adorned with jewels, but all as ignorant as children. They were entertained with a magic lantern, picture books and music, but little conversation was possible owing to their ignorance of the commonest things ; they could not even understand the pictures, from not knowing the objects they refer to. Some of them did not know the difference between a ship and a cart ! They live the dreariest, most aimless life that can be imagined, worse than that of the prisoners in

jails ; they cannot read or sew, and have no occupation except cooking their husband's food, which they are not allowed to eat with him. The great difficulty of the Zenana work is to get access to them at all, but this is gradually being overcome, especially when the visiting ladies are doctors.

At 1 p.m. on Friday we all went to the Great Mosque to see the Mohammedan worship which takes place at that hour. Friday is their Sabbath. It was a very impressive sight. Some thousands of people were assembled in the great courtyard ; they first washed in the tank or fountain in the centre. They must wash their feet, hands, face, nose, and mouth before worshipping. Then a pulpit was placed in front of the Mosque, and three priests or Imaums ascended it ; another priest read passages from the Koran to the assembly, and at a given signal from the priests they all prostrated themselves on the ground, touching it with their foreheads ; this they repeated several times. It was striking to see the assemblage moving with one accord, like the waves of the sea ; they repeated certain words in common. Our guide, a Mohammedan, was fervent in his devotions. I asked him afterwards what prayers he uttered, and he said he repeated the words "God is Great" over and over, and apparently said nothing else. The service occupied half an hour, and we left impressed with the great vitality of Mohammedanism. It is a far more fierce and intolerant form of faith than Hindooism, and few converts are made to Christianity, but when made they are more thorough and constant.

In the afternoon we revisited some more places in the town, and I went in the evening to an entertainment at a native gentleman's house two miles in the country. The leading Hindoos had heard of me from Mr. ——, who is here at present, and was most urgent that I should attend a social gathering. It began about 9 p.m., but the guests kept dropping in till 10 or 11 p.m. Time seems to be of no account in India, and we could not get away till after 12. It was an odd entertainment to our notions. Four chairs were placed for the English sahibs (gentlemen) at the end of the room, and some 40 or 50 natives squatted round the room, smoking hookahs in a most impassive manner, each one dressed differently from the others. A musical band performed dreariest music, accompanied by a shrill female voice ; there was no harmony in our sense of the word. This continued for most of the evening. I found, however, some intelligent and interesting English-speaking natives, especially a Brahmin, converted to Christianity, who had just arrived from Edinburgh, where he had been for six years studying medicine.

LAURIE'S HOTEL, AGRA,
Monday, February 15, 1886.

I now commence another letter to describe this wonderful city ; my last was closed on Friday at Delhi. We left there on Saturday at 1.30 p.m. and arrived here at 9 p.m. and got comfortable rooms in this excellent hotel. We had engaged our rooms some days before, and it was well, as 22 people were turned away that night. This is evidently

MAUSOLEUM OF EMPEROR HUMAYOUN, DELHI

Photo by Frith & Co., Ltd

a great centre for travellers, and some 50 English people sit down to dinner here every day. We spent Sunday quietly ; went to the English Church service in the morning, where we had quite a military congregation ; some hundreds of soldiers present, fine-looking men of the Manchester and Lincoln regiments. I then presented a letter of introduction to the Baptist Mission here, which is very strong, having 13 agents, including three Zenana ladies, who are to dine with us to-night. I went to a native Christian service in the afternoon ; some 30 present, and to the Havelock Baptist Chapel in the evening, where we had a good English congregation, including several red coats.

This morning we sallied out before breakfast to have our first view of the famous Taj Mahal. We had heard such ravishing descriptions of its beauty that we expected to be disappointed, as people usually are when anything is overpraised. We drove two miles outside the town, and were landed at a splendid gateway, made of red sandstone interlined with marble, so imposing that we thought it a fine mosque, but it only serves as an approach to the fairy-like structure of pure white marble which bursts upon your sight as soon as you enter the gateway. We stood spellbound for a few minutes at this lovely apparition ; it hardly seems of the earth, earthy. It is more like a dream of celestial beauty. No words can describe it. We felt that all previous sights were dimmed in comparison. No such effect is produced by the first view of St. Peter's, or Milan or Cologne Cathedrals ; they are all majestic, but this is enchantment itself. So perfect is the form that all other structures seem clumsy. The first impression it gives is that of a temple of white ivory, draped in white Brussels lace. The exquisite carving and tracery on the walls look like lace rather than sculpture. A beautiful dome crowns the building, and four graceful minarets stand at each angle some distance apart ; they remind one of the Eddystone Lighthouse, built of white marble. Such is the dazzling whiteness that it looks like a work of art when first unveiled ; but it is 250 years old, and was built by the Emperor Shah Jehan in honour of a favourite wife. It seems descending to the region of the commonplace to say that it cost 3 millions sterling, and took 17 years to build, and employed 20,000 workmen.

The finest view of the Taj is said to be from the top of the gateway, some 400 yards in front of it. I climbed to this point and contemplated leisurely the glorious vision in front of me. The foreground is filled up with a grove of deep-green foliage, very refreshing to the eye under the dazzling glare of the sun, and looking like an oasis amid the parched and dusty plains of India. In the middle of this grove lies a long narrow pool of water, lined with cypress. Masses of flowering shrubs relieve the deep green, especially the red blossom of the bouganvillia, which hangs in immense clusters ; sometimes the whole tree is one blaze of colour. Bright-plumed birds flit about the trees, especially the gay green parrot, and a confused hum of chirping is heard all over the place. It is a veritable earthly paradise !

The great dome of the Taj, flanked with its four graceful minarets, like so many satellites, has a softness of colour and outline which

rests the eye. The Taj itself stands upon a great marble platform, raised some feet above the ground, and it again rests upon a still larger basement of red sandstone, The building is thus raised above all the surrounding country, and can be seen from a great distance. Many fine buildings are injured by commonplace surroundings, for instance St. Paul's and Cologne Cathedrals, and so their effect is partly lost. Not so the Taj. It gleams like a lighthouse over all the plain of Agra; it is reflected on the broad bosom of the Jumna, which flows on one side, and the spacious windings of the river form one of the finest features of the landscape which spreads before me.

I find it beyond my power to describe the architecture. The building is square in form, rounded at the edges with a great alcove or hollow arch in the middle of each side. Two smaller double alcoves fill the spaces between the great ones; four smaller domes or cupolas stand on the roof round the great central dome; the four large minarets stand at the four angles of the great marble platform, several hundred feet from the main building. Two very handsome mosques face the Taj on the right and left, each built of red sandstone inlaid with white marble, and crowned with three white domes. The surface of the Taj is ornamented with the choicest inlaid work. India was ransacked for precious stones to adorn it. The windows are covered with fine marble screens, cut into graceful patterns. Long rows of Arabic characters in black are inlaid into the white marble; these are verses from the Koran. So numerous are they that one-eighth of the whole volume is said to be engraven on the building. One thing more I may mention. I discern an ugly black spot under the central arch; on closer examination it turns out to be a nest of wild bees. We find this curious pendant to nearly every large arch in Northern India; we have counted as many as twelve under the roof of one Mosque. They look like large black bags, and you hear a constant hum of bees about them. The natives never touch them, or indeed any kind of bird or beast, as the Hindoos regard animal life as sacred; hence all animals are very tame in India. Squirrels hop about on the roads, and birds almost alight on your head. The natives look upon Europeans as a sort of blood-thirsty savages, because they eat flesh meat and kill animals! Indeed the mass of Hindoos regard the eating of flesh and drinking of wine as the chief badge of Christianity! Not very flattering to us!

But I must now descend from my perch and give some account of the interior of the edifice. I seat myself on the tomb erected to Shah Jehan in the interior, under the great dome. We have entered by a door in the central alcove. At first it seems dark, after the bright sunshine outside. No direct light falls into the interior; it is like a shell within an outer case, and the light percolates dimly through the marble fretwork. The tomb of the Emperor and that of his favourite wife lie side by side. They are of white marble, inlaid with rich gems; emeralds, turquoises, agates, cornelians, lapis lazuli and coral abound. A railing or screen of pierced marble, wrought into elegant designs, surrounds the tombs. After remaining some time in the interior it appears quite light, and

THE FORT, DELHI

one can see that the vaults are covered with inscriptions from the Koran. Nothing strikes one in Mohammedan countries more than the reverence paid to their sacred book. A dado runs round the whole interior, of marble beautifully carved into flowers, and vases done on panels, each surrounded with a running scroll of inlaid work of precious stones.

A wonderful echo is heard when a chord of music is struck, reverberating round the hall, and dying into stillness. It is said to surpass that of the famous Baptistry of Pisa. I have once more changed my point of view, and mounted to the top of one of the minarets, 130 feet high, and look into the very heart of the Taj, as you might do into the snowy ravines of the Alps from a neighbouring peak. The dome is now seen to be of an oval shape, not unlike an inflated balloon. Four minor domes or turrets surround it, and 16 little minarets outflank the turrets. The two mosques and the noble gateway, like a sort of triumphal arch, look very well from this point. One more feature deserves to be mentioned. The great Fort of Agra, with its huge double wall, built by Akbar, fills up the landscape on the West, and beyond it the city of Agra is seen peeping out of a forest of trees. A great railway bridge spans the Jumna a little way off. Here I must stop, for impatient voices call me down.

GWALIOR DÅK BUNGALOW,
Friday, February 19, 8 *p.m.*

I have just received, at this out-of-the-way place, half an hour ago, the surprising telegram that I am chosen the Liberal candidate for Flintshire, in place of Lord Richard Grosvenor, retired; that the election will be in twelve days, and that my success is assured.[1] I hardly know how to regard this news. It is a great compliment to pay me; but we had all set our heart on "going round the world." We were planning visits to Australia, Japan and I know not where, and rejoicing in being free from "the trammels of public life."

You will wonder how I come to date this part of my letter from Gwalior, the capital of Scindia's dominions, one of the principal native States in India. It is only 75 miles from Agra, and we thought we would take a run here to see the far-famed fortress which our Government is about to restore to Scindia. Mrs. S. and Miss J. remained behind, as the accommodation is rough here, and I took Mr. B. and the two boys. We left at 9 a.m. to-day, and got here by a slow train about 2 p.m. It was so cold on the way that I could hardly keep warm with two topcoats! We have visited the Fort and the Palace. The former is a wonderful natural fortress; a long rocky plateau, surrounded by a perpendicular wall of rock. One would say it was quite impregnable. The red coats are still there, but are to be withdrawn next month as a proof of confidence in Scindia, who has always been very loyal to us. There is nothing in the Palace worth seeing. It was hardly worth the fatigue of coming here, and starting at 6.30 a.m. to-morrow. The weather has again become very cold, with a curious

[1] I defer reference to this point till these letters are concluded.

dull haze, very uncommon in India ; one can hardly see more than two or three miles.

I now resume my doings at Agra. I need not say more about the Taj. The account I have already given embraces several visits, but the impressions were written on the spot, and transcribed here. Everything else is so dwarfed by the Taj that it seems hardly worth while mentioning other buildings, though there are many of great interest in Agra and the vicinity. We visited the Palace of Akbar outside the Fort, and the beautiful Pearl Mosque, which some think the finest in India. On Tuesday we visited the Tomb of the great Akbar, the greatest monarch that India ever possessed, at Secundra, 8 miles out of Agra. It is a huge erection of red sandstone, raised on a lofty platform, and with a lovely white marble screen at the top. On one of the windows are the 99 names of God from the Koran, and it is the custom for parents to bring their sick children there, and wash over these names, and make them drink the water that they may recover. Our guide told us that the cure was always efficacious when the people had faith ! He told us of wonderful answers he had got to his prayers from his goddess !

After this we went to see an orphanage for native children, conducted by the Church Mission. There are 300 or 400 orphans brought up, mostly received at the time of the famine. They are educated as Christians ; the boys are trained to trades, and the girls are trained to be wives to native Christians, and are usually married at 16. This is considered a very late age in India, as the natives usually marry their daughters at 12 or 13. The poor creatures do not even see the men to whom they are to be married, and are usually shut up for life in a dark corner of the house ! The girls in the orphanage have the advantage of being allowed to say yes or no when young men come for wives ; all the suitable ones are trotted out, and the girl selected is asked if she will take the man, and she usually says yes. What would our ladies say to this ? What a simple method !

On Wednesday we made an expedition to a singular place, called Futtehpoor Sikri, a large deserted city. It was built by Akbar 300 years ago, meaning that it should be his capital ; but there was a Fakeer—a holy man, or hermit—who lived there, and he complained that the noise of the traffic interfered with his devotions, and intimated to the Emperor that he must leave the place unless he obtained quiet ; so the great Emperor said that as one or other must move he would do so, and forthwith he abandoned the city to the hermit, and went and built Agra instead ! I believe this is quite a true story.

There are many large buildings in the Hindoo style, and a tomb of marble, exquisitely sculptured, with the finest fretwork, in honour of the saint. We had a long drive that day of 22 miles each way, and it was very cold, but we enjoyed the sight of the country life. We passed through several large villages, and each had several wells, and it was a pretty sight to see the bullocks drawing the rope which pulled up the bucket of water. The boys have photographed some of them, which I hope will enable you to realize the scene.



THE PALACE, DELHI

Photo by Frith & Co., Ltd

All these village wells are of the same pattern, and worked in the same way. Wherever there is a well there is an oasis of green verdure around it. Water is the life blood of India, and far more valuable than the richest mines.

Monday, February 22.

I must now close, as we start for Lucknow this afternoon. I had a most interesting conference with leading natives here on Saturday evening at one of their houses. I am deeply impressed by the poverty of this country, and the defects of our system of government, which I will explain more fully at some other time.

Yesterday we attended service at the Havelock Baptist Chapel in the morning and the Church of England in the evening, and I also attended a service of native Christians, at which 70 or 80 were present. To day we went over the Government College here, a splendid institution, and obtained much valuable information; but I must draw to a close.

LUCKNOW,
Wednesday, February 24, 1886.

My last was from Agra last Monday. We left there that evening, and travelled by night to Cawnpore; waited in our carriage there for some time, and arrived here at 10 yesterday.

Of course our great interest was in the scenes of the famous siege, which is, perhaps, the most memorable event in the annals of the Mutiny. For about four months the little garrison of 1,800 men, nearly half of whom were natives, along with a number of women and children, were hemmed in by 50,000 armed rebels. They only occupied a chain of private houses, which luckily contained some deep cellars, in which the women and children found shelter. Nearly half the garrison perished during the siege, but they never yielded a point to the enemy, though most of the buildings were battered almost into ruins; they are preserved just as they were left at the siege, and the grounds are prettily laid out as gardens.

I transcribe the following from my note book :—

I am sitting on the steps of the monument erected to Sir H. Lawrence in the grounds of the Presidency. What a contrast to the awful times of the siege! Now it is a beautiful garden; monthly roses and other flowers cover the slope that leads up to the monument, and the battered buildings in front of me are clothed with creepers, especially the scarlet bouganvillia and the yellow bignonia. The various buildings occupied by the garrison are little better than heaps of ruins; most of them are perforated by cannon balls, and pitted all over with rifle shot. We saw the room where Sir H. Lawrence received his death wound, and the one where he died. We saw the two heavy naval guns which General Peel brought from his ship for the relief of Lucknow. I think he was killed. He was the son of the great Sir Robert Peel, and brother of the present Speaker.

We then visited the cemetery, where many of our brave countrymen sleep. We saw one tomb, erected to the memory of 360 men of the

York and Lancaster Regiment, who died during the Mutiny ; another to 271 of the 91st Light Infantry ; another to 382 of the first Indian Fusiliers. These figures do not include officers, of whom many also died. On the simple tomb of Sir H. Lawrence are engraved these words, " Here lies H. Lawrence, who tried to do his duty. May the Lord have mercy on his soul." Our native guide was himself inside the Presidency during the siege, acting as servant to Captain Fulton, who was killed ; his sympathies seem to be with us, not with the mutineers. I am surprised at the apathy with which the natives talk about the Mutiny, and the terrible events connected with it. They describe it without a vestige of emotion, as if it had happened in a remote country with which they had nothing to do !

It was very hot to-day. There has again been a sudden change in temperature ; it has risen to 85° in the shade during the heat of the day, which is from 12 to 4 p.m., but we feel no inconvenience. It is very cool at night, and we sleep well. We are quite comfortable in the hotels, which are much better than we were led to expect. I may add, they are much cheaper than in England ; indeed everything in India is very cheap.

We were disappointed in the architecture of Lucknow. It appears poor and tawdry after the splendid edifices of Agra. No marble is employed ; it is brick, with plaster and stucco, and the taste is execrable. The various palaces and mosques we visited are not worth describing ; we were more interested in the people and their life. Lucknow is the third greatest city in India, having 460,000 inhabitants. It is the capital of the province of Oudh, which was annexed by Lord Dalhousie, against the wish of the people, and this had much to do with the Mutiny. We spent a good deal of time again in the Bazaar.

I again transcribe from my note book :—

I am sitting in a carriage in a narrow street of the Bazaar, while the rest of the party are making purchases in a native shop. The sides of the streets are occupied by rows of small shops, mostly at this point for the sale of brazen or copper pots ; each native must have one of these for drinking, for no native will take water out of a vessel used by one of another caste. The stock in trade of many of the shops could be bought for 20*s*.

A constant stream of people is passing. Let me describe some of them. There goes a half-naked coolie, with panniers full of cut grass swinging from his shoulders ; an old man, leaning on a stick, in a Joseph's coat of many colours ; a coolie, with crates full of live doves ; a bheestie (or water carrier), with a skin full of water to lay the dust. There goes a drove of tiny donkeys with panniers ; then three women, covered with loose calico, like mummies ; an almost naked coolie, with an enormous load of cut straw on his head. I note in passing that no two people are dressed alike. I see nothing but cotton clothing, though many have but scant allowance. Here and there I see men with cotton quilts rolled round them ; some wear turbans, but most of them small cotton caps. They generally wear loose slippers, which they throw off on entering a house. A coolie now passes, with a great

JUMMA MUSJID, DELHI

Photo by Frith & Co., Ltd

water pot on his head; now two men pass, carrying something like a coffin. It is a native lady enclosed in curtains; they style it "going in purdah." Fashion prescribes this as rigidly in India as it does in London that ladies should appear in extremely low dresses at evening parties! A London drawing room would shock the moral sense of Hindoos as much as a bull fight would ours! Occasionally men pass carrying long stalks of sugar cane, which the people chew. Hindoos are fond of sweet things, like all people who do not use alcohol. A peon, or Government servant, with a gay uniform, now passes me; then a wild-looking man, with black matted hair; a woman, with huge turned-up yellow slippers. The women's ankles and arms are often loaded with bracelets or bangles, usually of copper or brass, and only worth a few pence. As a rule their noses are also pierced with rings, from which hang rude ornaments.

Now comes a long line of pilgrims, with baskets suspended from a pole which rests upon their shoulders, in which are their travelling effects. You meet these pilgrims constantly. Hindoos all try to visit some of their sacred shrines, especially "the holy city of Benares." They sometimes travel on foot for months, and often die on the way, poor creatures. Now pass four coolies, with baskets containing dried manure on their heads. The natives generally use dried cow manure for fuel, which robs the soil of its proper nourishment. A smart policeman, in blue uniform and red turban, now passes. The police seem to take life easily in India. You never see a street row or a quarrel, never a drunken man or a mob. Our low streets at home present far more odious sights. The Hindoos are a most gentle and peaceable people, and submit to superior authority as a matter of course. A gay native now passes in a drab coat and blue silk trousers. What think you of the conjunction of colours? A man, with a large white umbrella, goes in front. I have only seen one other native using an umbrella, and it was a red one; they do not feel the sun as we do. A poor old man is now asking me for alms; he has loose grey hair, no cap; he leans upon his staff. There are many beggars, but usually they are not obtrusive, except at temples and mosques, where multitudes congregate. A boy passes, with a tray filled with coarse sweetmeats; this is a great trade among the natives. A coolie now passes, with two heavy grindstones on his head; they are commonly used by the women to grind corn, as in Bible days. The upper stone is turned round by a handle upon the nether stone. A father passes, leading his little girl, almost nude; many of the children wear no clothes till they are 6 or 7. One wonders how they live during the cold season, when there is sometimes ice at night. A man passes with two water pots, on which he taps with an iron ring; he stops, and supplies people with a drink of water. An old man, whose legs are paralysed, is crawling along, with some sacking under his arm. I now hear a singing woman making a melancholy noise. There is no melody in our sense of the word; it is a sad monotone, in a minor key. You seldom or never hear a Hindoo laugh, or indeed express any strong emotion. Very few women are visible in the streets, and those only of the lower castes; most of them

have large nose rings. The sad music now approaches, and I see there are three females, of whom two sing alternately. They have bare feet, and are clothed in thin muslins, which hang loosely about them, and almost cover their faces ; two of them carry brass vessels. I put a few pice into one of them. People here seldom thank you for anything ; they take what you give in an apathetic sort of way. Nobody in India makes a fuss about anything ; the wheels of life glide on noiselessly.

I remark, in passing, that the shops present the appearance of two rows of piazzas, partitioned off into small wooden boxes ; each has an outer and an inner division : they expose their wares in the outer, and do their work in the inner one. The women seem to live in the upper story ; they are hardly ever seen : all external work is done by men. The rooms, or compartments of the shop, are 5 or 6 feet square, and in this small space there are often four or five people squatting ; no one sits on a chair or any kind of seat.

We now drive along the street, and I take note of the various kinds of shops, which afford a clue to the industries carried on. I give you a list :—Tinware, money changing, pipes, printing, bookbinding, seeds, sweetmeats, cooking food, kites, string, cooked food, betelnut, caps, beads, English hand knitting, gold thread, native pictures, stamping cloth in silver, spinning silk, prints, types for printing, precious stones, jewellery, lacquer work, braided caps, pottery, tin lamps, hookas, lamps and dishes, bags, hempen cord, watch or clock making, etc. I might multiply the list indefinitely. The goods represent very little value, and seem to us rather to supply the secondary than the primary wants of man.

When we returned to our hotel we saw some extraordinary performances of Indian jugglers. They did the sort of things that Maskelyne and Cook do, but also some wonderful experiments with snakes. They had a box in which was a live cobra and another snake, which they freely handled, to our horror. The cobra darted his fang several times at the man, but we learned that the poison had been extracted. Then he put the other snake on the verandah, and set a mongoose at it—a sort of large rat, which is the deadly enemy of snakes ; it fastened on its head, and apparently hacked it in pieces, till the snake lay quite dead to all appearance, and a swarm of flies settled on its bloody head, as they do on dead bodies. Then the man offered to bring it to life again, if we would give him four annas extra, which we did, and he played a musical instrument, whereupon the creature began to move ; he then pulled it with his hand, and it revived, and he put it back in the box ! It reminded us of Pharaoh's magicians, " who did the like with their enchantments."

In the afternoon we called upon a fine young soldier, a corporal of the 17th Lancers, who had made our acquaintance at Agra ; he had been a member of the Liverpool Gymnasium and Y.M.C.A. and was the champion player at the Gymnasium. He showed us all over the lines, stables, etc., and ended by taking us to the coffee room, of which he was secretary, and where he worked for the good of the men along with the Chaplain. It was crammed with soldiers amusing themselves in an

THE MOTEE MUSJID, AGRA

Photo by Frith & Co. Ltd

innocent way ; five hundred belonged to it. There is a large garrison at Lucknow, some 5,000 or 6,000 men, of whom half are British. S. dined with us in the evening ; we felt a great interest in him, and hope he will soon get a commission—he is looking for it and well deserves it. The soldiers in India are much better off than at home, and like it better ; much is now done for them, and certainly those we saw looked well and hearty, and in fine condition. I except Delhi, where the barracks are not healthy. Many of the soldiers are now total abstainers, but there is still a good deal of drunkenness, and its effects are far worse in India than in England. The condition of the soldiers is, however, much better than it was in former years.

We left Lucknow on Thursday morning early, for Cawnpore, meaning to spend the day there, and see the scenes of the terrible massacre which has painfully immortalized " the well of Cawnpore," but on reaching the latter place we found the trains from Cawnpore so awkward that we resolved to go direct to Benares, and I am continuing my letter from that place, on Saturday, February 27.

We travelled all day and reached the station for Benares, which is on the far side of the Ganges, at 11.30 p.m. We crossed that famous river on a rickety bridge of boats. It is now the dry season, and the bed of the river is only partly covered by water ; indeed, the volume seems small in comparison with the great American rivers, but in the rainy season it rises 50 feet, and becomes a gigantic stream, overflowing all the level country. We had then to drive four miles through the city to our hotel (Clarke's), situated near the cantonment. It was a lovely drive ; we saw a good many lights in the native houses, and several people at work. We were thankful to get home and get to bed, tired, at 1 a.m.

Yesterday we visited some of the temples of the city. This place is the headquarters of Hindoo worship, and multitudes of pilgrims come annually to bathe in the sacred Ganges. It is a city " wholly given to idolatry " ; it has 1,000 temples, and I do not know how many priests and idols. We have been through several of the temples yesterday and to-day ; architecturally they are poor affairs, far inferior to the great mosques of Delhi and Agra. The general impression left on you is pity for the degraded superstition of the people. One temple is sacred to monkeys, and these creatures run loose about it ; another to cows, and we saw a number of them inside ! There is hardly anything in heaven or earth that is not worshipped by some sect of Hindoos ; but the most striking sight was the bathing in the river. We started about seven this morning, and took a boat on the river, and rowed along the banks, and saw crowds of Hindoos bathing in the filthy water. All sorts of impurities float on the surface—it is a sickening sight ; yet they drink this horrid mixture, which is like pea soup, and take home large pots of it for use !

We saw many large straw umbrellas on little platforms on the bank, and under each of these a priest is seated, who puts paint on the higher caste natives, after they have bathed. Some of the Brahmins have the upper part of the body painted all over, and we saw upon them the

sacred thread, which they receive at consecration, and which th never cast off ; only the higher castes wear the thread, those who we it are called " twice-born " ; it is just a common piece of string. V saw the separate place reserved for the bathing of widows ; they a forbidden by Hindoo law to re-marry, and are treated as outcasts. V also saw where the bodies of the dead are burned, and one corpse w being consumed in a fire of sticks as we passed. The higher and rich castes burn their dead ; the common people bury or throw the bodi into the Ganges, where they are devoured by vultures. Along t river are rows of large houses, built by native Rajahs (princes) ; th all aim at having a house at Benares, and when they think their e is approaching they come here to die.

On our way home we passed the building or shed in which is ke the famous " Car of Juggernath." How different it looks from t famous structure we are familiar with in missionary records! It w a poor commonplace-looking machine ; a sort of wooden platfor 6 feet high, running upon a number of small wheels, and upon t platform a small wooden canopy, inside of which is placed an ima and a priest on the days of procession. The law now forbids a human sacrifices, so no victims are now crushed under its whee The boys photographed it. I understand there are several other sacr cars in other cities of India, some of them larger than this one.

We are going out this afternoon to pay a visit to the Rajah of Be ares, who has expressed a wish to see us ; and in the evening we expe the heads of the Church of England Missionary Society to dine with u and we hope to hear from them something of the progress of missi work. This is quite their headquarters, and most societies are esta lished here. The New Testament is being revised here by twel missionaries, who occupy the palace of one of the Rajahs, who has plac it at their disposal. Is it not odd ? and he is not a Christian !

Sunday, February 28.

I will now close this letter, as to-morrow we go on to Calcutta, and shall hardly have time to write from there before the mail closes. V shall anxiously await the news of the Election. Success will not be cause of much joy to us, for we are unwilling to plunge so soon into t whirlpool of London life. We went to the English Church this mornin and heard a good practical address, the congregation chiefly soldie In the evening we go to the Baptist Church, where a Presbyteria Mr. Gray from Ajmere, is to preach. We had four of the Chur Missionary Society's agents with us last evening ; they were ni people, and we enjoyed their company. They all testify that progre is very slow ; the most promising work is the training of the youn they have a Normal School and an Orphanage under their charge.

10 p.m.—We have just been to the Baptist Chapel, and heard excellent sermon from the Presbyterian missionary of Ajmere, who here as one of the translators of the New Testament. Three of t Baptist missionaries spent the evening with us afterwards. And no I must close.

TAJ MAHAL, AGRA

Photo by Frith & Co., Ltd

CHAPTER XXII

Election for Flintshire—Indian Problems

From Gwalior we went to Calcutta, and there I received news of my election for Flintshire by a majority of 1,500, in place of Lord Richard Grosvenor, resigned—now known as Lord Stalbridge. He was long the popular Whip of the Liberal Party under Mr. Gladstone, who had also the support of his brother, the late Duke of Westminster. His adoption of Home Rule lost him the support of the Westminster family, who became strong Liberal Unionists.

Let me here say that my election for a Welsh constituency made a great change in my life. Our travelling party were disappointed at the sudden termination of our tour, and I had some difficulty in making up my mind to accept the most kind offer which was telegraphed me to Lucknow. But when I reflected that I was offered a constituency where I was personally unknown to every one, and that they undertook to fight the election in my absence, I felt I should not deserve such a proof of confidence if I declined the invitation. I replied from Lucknow, accepting the offer, and telegraphed a short election address of forty words! My brother James, aided by several of my Liverpool friends, threw himself into the contest. The election took place in a dreadful snow-storm, when travelling was most difficult. My supporters were of the poorer class; they had few carriages, but enthusiasm made up for conveyances. They waded through the snow and gave me as great a majority as their previous member had!

I should here mention that Lord Salisbury's government was defeated at the opening of Parliament on an Amendment to the Address moved by Jesse Collings in favour of labourers' allotments (popularly known as "Three Acres and a Cow"). It was impossible they could stand, as the Liberals mustered 334 to 250 Conservatives, and the Parnellites were eighty-six. So Mr. Gladstone formed a Government with John Morley as his Irish secretary, while Cham-

berlain and Dilke were leading members, but Lord Hartington and Lord Derby declined to co-operate. Home Rule was not raised at the previous election, but it was well understood that Mr. Gladstone had some scheme in his mind looking in that direction.

At my bye election Home Rule was not raised, at least not to my cognizance, and I was returned uncommitted to that policy, and, if I must speak truly, I was not then favourable to setting up an Irish legislature. I had heartily supported all Mr. Gladstone's agrarian legislation in Ireland. I was most anxious to appease Irish discontent. I was deeply impressed by the past misgovernment of Ireland, but I was not then prepared for such a revolution in our methods of government. However, I must defer this to a later stage, and continue for some time my impressions on the vast problems of Indian administration.

I was able to spend only a few days in Calcutta. We reluctantly abandoned a trip to Darjeeling in the heart of the grandest mountain ranges of the world. I gave up my time to interview the leading officials such as Sir Auckland Colville, and Sir David Barbour, both great financiers, and also, like myself, bimetallists; also Sir Theodore Hope, head of the railway department, Sir Courtenay Ilbert, now our chief clerk in the House of Commons, then the legal member of the Viceroy's Council, and some others. The Governor General, Lord Dufferin, was absent in Burmah. I also met the British-Indian Association, and had a long conference with some fifty of the leading natives, mostly Congress men. I found there, as indeed everywhere, much discontent with our methods of government. I derived much information from reading the great famine report—made after the terrible Madras famine of 1876-7—the most instructive Indian State paper I have ever perused. It gives a complete account of the social and agricultural system of India. Sir James Caird and other agricultural experts sat upon the famine commission. I also read Caird's book and others of the same class on India, and became more and more impressed with the reality of the complaints of the desperate poverty of large sections of the population. In the awful Madras famine it was calculated that five millions of people perished. Since then even larger and more terrible droughts and famines have occurred, especially those of 1897 and 1900, but the mortality was not nearly so great, owing to the splendid exertions made by the Government. But the fact of Indian poverty is now

KUTUB MINAR AND RUINS

Photo by Frith & Co.

acknowledged by all. It was not so then. I was staggered at the information I got. I employed my time on the voyage home, which occupied a month, to write out my conclusions, which were published as two articles in the *Contemporary Review*, and were replied to by Sir Mountstuart Grant Duff, Governor of Madras, in other two articles.

I may here state that I attended almost every debate on India in the next sixteen years, except the last two Sessions, when in failing health. I repeatedly spoke and raised special Indian debates in those years. I made it my duty to read all the principal State papers on India. I derived much information from our eminent Anglo-Indians in Parliament, such as the late Sir George Campbell and Sir Richard Temple. I also met most of the able Indian delegates who visited this country, and availed myself of their information. I have thus built upon the foundation laid in 1886, and for that reason I venture to summarize my conclusions published in the *Contemporary*, for they represent in substance the maturest views I have been able to form over a long period of time. I revise the figures to date, but do not alter my conclusions, which have only grown and strengthened by the lapse of years.

COMPLEXITY OF INDIAN PROBLEMS AND POVERTY OF THE PEOPLE.

I am well aware of the folly of pretending to sit in judgment on the government of India, after a couple of visits, separated by an interval of twenty-three years. The vastness and complexity of Indian questions grow upon the mind increasingly, and the wider your knowledge the greater is your sense of ignorance. India is, in fact, a continent rather than a country—a congeries of races and languages, not a nation. What is true in one part is false in another. What is politic in the Punjaub is folly in Bengal. What is suitable in the North is out of place in the South. Consequently all generalisations are dangerous. To assert general laws for India is like laying down principles for all Europe. The frontier tribes differ as much from the Bengalees or Madrasees as Finland differs from Naples. Consequently great caution is needed in writing about India, and the difficulty is increased by the vehement contradiction one meets on every point of Indian policy. The views of the Indians and Europeans are often diametrically opposed. The official and non-official classes differ widely from each other. Indian problems, looked at from the points of view of a native, a civilian, a missionary, or a soldier, are about as different as the starry

heavens, looked at through the telescope of Newton or the eye of an ancient astrologer.

There is no agreement in India either upon facts or inferences. All statistics are disputed—all conclusions are questioned. A traveller no sooner ascertains what he thinks is a well-established fact, than he finds it vehemently disputed. He finds human testimony as unreliable as most of the evidence tendered before Indian courts of law, and he almost despairs of arriving at any valid conclusions.

This difficulty will not be felt by those who confine themselves to one class of opinion; for many travel through India with blinders, only seeing what official optimists wish them to see. You may remain entirely ignorant of what is thought by the 294 millions of people who inhabit the country (Census of 1901). Nothing is easier than to dogmatise when only evidence on one side is heard; but when an attempt to judge honestly is made, amid the Babel of contradictions one hears, the task is enough to daunt the boldest.

It is, therefore, with much diffidence that I offer some remarks on the strange phenomena of our Indian Empire, so unlike anything the world has ever seen, that no historical analogies give much aid in comprehending it.

I begin by observing that the general opinion at home is that India is immensely indebted to British rule; that we have converted a land of anarchy and misrule into one of peace and contentment; that poverty is giving place to plenty, and a low, corrupt civilization to one immensely higher. It is somewhat of a shock to the optimist to learn that every one of these points is contested by well-educated and intelligent natives; instead of contentment one finds in many places great dissatisfaction, and a widespread belief that India is getting poorer and less happy. Without at present controverting these opinions, I will offer some remarks upon the social economy of the country, which are necessary to any true understanding of Indian problems.

The first and deepest impression made upon me by this second visit to India is a heightened sense of the poverty of the country. It is greater and more widespread than almost any one in England realizes, and the most important political consequences follow from the recognition of this fact. I have taken some pains to form an estimate of the wealth in India, and have been startled at the result. The able Finance Minister, Sir Evelyn Baring, now Lord Cromer, estimated the average income of the people at 27 rupees per head in 1882. The rupee was then worth about 1*s.* 8*d.*: now it is fixed at 1*s.* 4*d.* Lord Curzon now (1901) estimates the average income at 30 rupees, or £2 per head; and that of the agricultural population, which is 80 per cent. of the whole, at 20 rupees, or £1 6*s.* 8*d.* per head. This would give 462 millions sterling as the aggregate income of the 231 millions[1] of people in British territory. Sir Robert Giffen, our best statist, in a recent article in the *Times*, puts the aggregate income of the United

[1] India, including Burmah, contains, by the last Census, 294 millions of people, of whom 231 millions are in British territory.

MOSQUE OF AURUNGZEBE, BENARES

Photo by Frith & Co., Ltd



Kingdom at 1,500 to 1,600 millions, or £37[1] per head. I must add, however, that the most intelligent natives I met put the income of India at less than those figures. Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, than whom there are few better statists in India, puts the average income at only 20 rupees per head, or at the rate of 1*s.* 4*d.* per rupee, equal to 308 millions sterling for British India. These very low estimates are confirmed by much collateral evidence. The average rate of wages up country is from 2 to 4 annas for common labour, or say, at the present value of the rupee 2*d.* to 4*d.* per day—not a tenth of what is paid for the same class of labour in England. In districts remote from European travel it is even less. Then the income-tax tables show a marvellously small area of high incomes. It is well known that a penny on the income tax produces about two and a half millions sterling in England, and the assessment commences with incomes of £160 per annum. In India the same rate, commencing with incomes of 500 rupees per annum, but with some large exceptions (such as the native Zemindars, or land owners), produces about £200,000 per annum. The comparison is not at all an exact one, but, speaking broadly, I should say that an income tax in India scarcely yields one-twelfth of what it does in the United Kingdom, though the population is nearly six times as large. The great complaints in many parts of India as to the pressure of the land revenue tell the same tale. The whole amount collected is 18 millions sterling at 1*s.* 4*d.* the rupee, which is little over 1*s.* 6*d.* per head of the population. It is hard to believe how so small a tax should press heavily; yet I fear it is an undoubted fact that in the poorer parts of the country it is collected with difficulty, and in years of scarcity causes great suffering. The produce of the land is extremely small, according to European standards, and I much doubt whether the entire agricultural produce of British India exceeds in value 250 millions sterling at 1*s.* 4*d.* per rupee.

The fact is human life is supported in India upon the barest minimum of necessaries; the village population feed upon the commonest grains, seldom eating animal food (which is contrary to their religion), and rarely tasting the finer grains, such as wheat and barley. The clothing worn is of the scantiest, and I was distressed to see many of the people in the North-West Provinces shivering and half naked in weather so cold that I was glad to wear two topcoats. The houses are built of clay, and almost destitute of furniture, and I understand that a large portion of the population only eat one meal a day. Of course this in an Eastern country does not signify what it does in Europe—life can be sustained on less food and less nutritious diet than in northern climes; the labour power of the Hindoos is small; there is far less taken out of the human machine than in our laborious western life: it consumes less and produces less; besides, the Asiatic has the power of digesting a greater quantity of food at one meal than is possible to Europeans; but, when due allowance is made for all this, it is not to be denied that the poverty of a great part of the people of India is extreme and more

[1] I incline to think this is too high, especially since the great fall in values that has recently taken place.

acute than what we witness in Europe. It may be said with truth of a great part of the rural population that it is never far removed from famine. A scanty harvest any year brings that calamity within measurable distance; a failure of crops means death to a large part of the population unless fed by Government.[1]

[1] Speech by W. S. Caine, M.P., on the Indian Famine Commission Report, February 3, 1902: "Two of the greatest authorities who have ever approached Indian problems have estimated the average income of these Indian agricultural peasants at 18 and 20 rupees per head per annum. I fail to find in the data given to us by either Lord Cromer or Lord Curzon any evidence of having deducted the interest to the money lender from their estimate of income. The entire indebtedness of the Indian peasant can of course only be estimated. From all the estimates I have seen made, a fair average appears to be £230,000,000. This comes out at £1 6*s.* per head of the peasant population. The interest averages at least 12 per cent. per annum, so that 3*s.* 3*d.* has to be deducted from the £1 6*s.* 8*d.* of Lord Curzon's estimated annual income, reducing it to £1 3*s.* 5*d.* per head per annum. If from this £1 3*s.* 5*d.* we further deduct the estimate of 1*s.* 6*d.* per head for rent, estimated by the noble lord in his budget statement, it reduces the income of the agricultural population of India to £1 1*s.* 11*d.*, or 263 pennies for 365 days. The estimate given by Mr. Digby, C.I.E., in his recent book is ¾*d.* per day, which is 274 pence. If, therefore, rent and interest to money lenders has to be paid out of Lord Curzon's £1 6*s.* 8*d.*, Lord Curzon is the worst pessimist of the two, and Mr. Digby is vindicated by the Viceroy himself. I will, however, be on the safe side and stick to £1 6*s.* 8*d.* throughout in the argument I am about to detail.

"I cannot pass from this part of my subject without some reference to the chief evidence of the horrible poverty of the agricultural people of India, the evidence of recurring famine with ever-increasing intensity. These famines are the eruptions of the smouldering volcano of Indian poverty, and the inevitable result of all the causes of poverty to which I have been referring. From cradle to funeral pyre the life of the Indian peasant is one prolonged never-ceasing struggle for something to eat. He has no time to think of anything else. Forty millions of them are hungry all the time; 50 millions more are often hungry; and none of them ever get anything better to eat than the coarsest cereals and vegetables, kept down by a little highly-taxed salt and a few cheap condiments. The whole of these 90 millions are worn by the most carking of all cares—debt they can never pay. When scarcity comes upon them it is little wonder that they lie down and die in heart-broken millions. These famines, when they come, are met with courage, generosity and skill, and the way in which the Indian Government has brought its system of relief to the highest point of efficiency, obtains the gratitude, and has won the admiration, of the world at large. It is now time that the Administrators of India, the choicest men this great Empire can furnish, should address themselves to famine prevention, and this House should refuse no help or encouragement. The Secretary of State for India, in the resolution before the House, invites approval of the several recommendations made in the Report of the Famine Commission. These are excellent in principle, and propose suspensions and remissions of revenue and rent, the establishment of Agricultural Banks, organic changes in the existing agrarian system of one province of India, Bombay, and schemes for the improvement of agriculture. If these are honestly and generously carried out no doubt much good will result. But at their best they are only palliatives which may relieve the patient for a time, but only postpone the hour of final dissolution. It is certainly a time for suspension and remission of rents, but the recommendations fall lamentably short of what is needed."

CONTRAST BETWEEN BRITISH AND INDIAN VIEWS OF INCREASE OF TRADE.

I have said that the chief complaint which educated Indians made against our Government was that it is too expensive, and that it drained the country of its wealth. A few words upon this latter head.

The great increase of the foreign trade of India is regarded with pride by the British. The value of the sea-borne external trade of India has risen in 66 years, ending 1900, from 14 to 213 crores of rupees, or 15 fold. Taking the present valuation of the rupee as 1*s.* 4*d.* this represents an annual trade now of 142 millions sterling. It is argued that this implies a great increase of wealth, and is a most striking proof of the material progress of India. The view taken by the natives themselves is widely different, and it is very important that it should be laid before the British public. It is held by them that the foreign trade represents the decay of native industries and the payment of a heavy tribute to England. I will take the last head first.

The statistics of foreign trade show that India exports much more than she imports, and this balance has been steadily increasing, till it now averages 21 crores, or 14 millions sterling annually. Speaking broadly, it may be said that India now exports 70 to 80 millions sterling, nearly all agricultural produce, and imports about 50 millions of merchandise and 10 to 12 millions of treasure. She is in the position so ardently desired by the nations of Europe before the time of Adam Smith, when the chief advantage of foreign trade was thought to lie in a surplus of exports to be paid for in bullion. The clearer light of economical science in our days has dissipated this illusion, and we know well that a surplus of exports means usually a debtor country, while a surplus of imports (as in England) means a creditor country. The natives press this point against us; they argue that as India exports annually some 14 millions sterling, for which there is no commercial return, she is drained of her wealth to that extent. The case will appear even stronger if we consider that the value of the imports of any country includes the cost of carrying the goods, viz: freight and commercial charges, and consequently most countries show a greater value of imports than exports. The United Kingdom, it is well known, now (1902) shows an annual net surplus of about 160 millions [1] sterling of imports, of which about one-third represents freight and the remainder interest on foreign investments. All European countries show a surplus of imports, more or less, and if India were only to receive the exact equivalent of her exports, she ought to import 90 millions sterling including bullion, in place of 60 to 65 millions as she does now, so that the real balance of trade against India appears to be nearly 30 millions annually. The question arises, how are we to account for this? Does it really represent, as some of the natives allege, an exhausting tribute paid to England?

[1] The five years ended 1900 (per *Statesman's Year Book*, which I take as my authority in all these calculations) shows an average surplus of imports over exports (including re-exports of foreign produce) of 160 millions.

We require to glance at the relations of the two countries in order to understand it. One great part of the work done by the British Government in India has been to cover the country with a network of railways, and make several valuable irrigation canals. In most countries such works are done by private enterprise, but it was necessary, in the undeveloped state of India, that they should either be done directly, or be guaranteed, by the State; moreover the capital had nearly all to be drawn from England. India has little surplus capital of its own, and what it has can be invested at much higher rates of interest than prevail in Europe, and so it came to pass that the great bulk had to be borrowed from England, on which interest at 3½ or 4 per cent. had to be paid in gold. The Indian Government has also contracted a large National Debt, say 164 millions sterling; part of it is covered by public works, but a great part is of the nature of our own and other national debts. The upshot of the whole matter is that a very large sum annually has to be remitted to England for interest by the Government of India; about as much more has to be remitted for pensions, military charges, stores, etc., making in all a sum of 17 millions a year for "Home charges." This represents the Government side of the account; but there is also a vast amount of private remittance from merchants and others in India who have capital employed or invested in that country. Most of the tea, coffee, and indigo plantations are worked by European capital; the foreign trade is nearly all so carried on, and there is much money annually remitted by Government servants for the maintenance of their families in England. When all these items are added together they easily account for this adverse balance of nearly 30 millions in the trade account of India.[1]

It will be seen that for most of this annual remittance India has received back a fair return. The railways and public works now yield an annual surplus to the Government after paying interest, and the private capital invested in India is also highly reproductive, and gives employment and maintenance to many of its people; but there is another portion on which the benefit to India is not so conspicuous. I refer to the pension list and military charges in England, and the interest on the National Debt, contracted for warlike expeditions.

[1] It is a great mistake to suppose that in all cases a surplus of exports over imports denotes loss to a country. The two most prosperous countries in the world—the United States of America and Australia—exhibit the same phenomenon. Australia's exports exceed its imports by £13,469,097 (figures for the year 1899); whereas the United States has the enormous excess of exports over imports of 470 millions sterling in the last four years! No doubt the case of Australia arises from the large amount of interest due on British capital invested in that country, which has yielded it immense advantage in spite of the payment of interest. The United States at one time had also to remit largely for interest on European capital invested in that country; but of late years it is believed that the Americans have bought back most of their securities invested abroad, and are now beginning to invest capital in Europe. No conclusive inferences can be drawn from tables of imports and exports; and altogether too much stress has been laid on what has been called "the exhausting drain from India."

It is not difficult to represent this as a burden imposed by a foreign power, and which India, if freed from British rule, could shake off. Matters have not come to that point yet; but it is easy to see, from the spread of anti-English literature and the influence of revolutionary thought coming in from Europe, that sooner or later such ideas will take root in India, and it becomes a grave question of policy whether it is wise for the Government to keep adding to the Indian debt held abroad. England has probably a stake of 300 millions sterling in India, in one shape or another. For much of that she has conferred a full equivalent in the shape of reproductive works; but, looking to the peculiar relations of the two countries, and to the fact that it is British rule which is the main security for the due payment of interest on this vast amount, one cannot but look with apprehension to the future. Were it possible to raise loans in India from the native capitalists, the solution would be much simpler; but at present that is impossible on any large scale.

I said that another reason why the natives looked with jealousy on the growth of the foreign trade of India was that it was largely at the expense of their home industries. It is hardly realized in England that our cheap machine-made goods have destroyed the bulk of the old hand-made manufactures of India. At one time a considerable part of the population was so employed. India now imports nearly 50 millions worth of merchandise, chiefly cotton cloth, hardware and pottery, which were once made at home. If we allow £2 per head as the annual income of each person in India, the making of these goods, allowing 10 millions as the cost of the raw material, must once have sustained about 20 millions of people. Now they are imported, no doubt at a cheaper cost, and according to the formulae of political economy the labour and capital so employed can be turned to more profitable directions, and India be a great gainer; but it so happens that the hand-loom weavers and the small artificers who made these goods in this simple native fashion, and as a hereditary calling, had no other trade to turn to. The capital which was their trained handicraft was destroyed, and they had either to starve, or take up vacant land for farming, or become coolies. Most of them took to agriculture; but it was a hard struggle to live, for all the good soil was already taken up, and they had to reclaim from the jungle barren land, on which they could barely subsist. The general result has been to make India more than ever a country of poor peasants, with little variety of pursuits. Of course this process greatly increases the foreign trade. The people of India require to export a large portion of the produce of the soil, in order to buy their clothing and utensils, and another large portion to liquidate the "Home charges" and private remittances made to England. When thus analysed it will be seen that it is futile to reckon increase of foreign trade as equivalent to increase of wealth; it is rather a substitution of foreign for domestic exchange. The food and raw produce are exchanged against the cloth and hardware of England, instead of against the products of innumerable small makers at home.

Yet there are some aspects in which the increased trade really means increased wealth. The railways have made many districts accessible which were not so before. Where surplus food was almost worthless it now finds a ready market, and in times of scarcity and famine the surplus of one part of India is quickly made available to supply the deficit in another part. No one can doubt that the railway carries with it both material and moral civilization. It tends to break up those foolish caste prejudices which have been the bane of India for thousands of years, and it enables the whole produce of the country to find a ready market.

It must also be remembered that though the old hand manufactures of India are dying out they are being replaced by the improved methods of European manufactures. Bombay resembles a Lancashire town in the number of its smoky chimneys. It has about 140 cotton mills, fitted with the best machinery of Oldham, and paying on the average much better dividends than similar factories do in England. The jute-manufacturing trade is leaving Dundee for the valley of the Ganges, and no one can doubt that India will in course of time recover much of the trade she has lost, and compete with Europe on equal terms. Labour is so immensely cheaper than in England, and the natives are so quick at the use of their fingers, that I suspect it is only a question of time to transfer to India a good deal of the trade of Lancashire. Already the Bombay mills have nearly deprived Lancashire of the trade with China in cotton yarn, and there are symptoms of still greater changes in the future. India is just now in a transition state. She has lost most of her primitive manufactures, and the change has been very painful, but she is acquiring the improved methods of Europe, and they will largely compensate her in course of time.

One more remark before I pass from the question of the value of India's foreign trade. It is often asked, What has become of the huge amount of bullion that India has absorbed in recent years? She has received on balance 480 millions sterling of silver and gold in the last 65 years, calculated at the average exchange of 1*s.* 8*d.* per rupee. What has become of it all? Many writers in England hold that this is a great proof of wealth. It is not so regarded in India; it is extremely difficult to say what becomes of the money: no one could give me a satisfactory answer; it is apparently diffused over that vast population, either in the form of coin or ornaments, and shows little visible sign of existence; probably much of it is hoarded. There still remains in India the feeling of mistrust, burned into the mind of the people through ages of pillage and anarchy. No property is considered by the villagers quite secure unless it can be hidden. Banks and bank notes are very little used; the rupee has to perform the ordinary exchanges of nearly 300 millions of people, and everything that can be spared is put upon the women in the shape of rings, bracelets, anklets and other ornaments. Of late years half of the bullion imported is in gold.[1] I doubt whether any safe conclusion can be drawn as to the

[1] This is owing to the virtual adoption of the gold standard in India, though nearly all the exchanges are performed by the rupee, which will always be the money

wealth and prosperity of the masses of the people merely on account of this absorption of bullion ; still it is undoubted that India has greatly replenished her currency as compared with the early part of the century, when it was deplorably scanty, and when the rudest means had to be adopted for the purpose of exchange.

Before parting from the subject of Indian trade I would further remark that the natives strongly assert that England forces upon them a fiscal policy unsuited for their country, but adapted to develop British commerce ; the system of taxation, they allege, is adapted to suit England rather than India, and this causes much heartburning and is a source of political danger in the future. The unanimous opinion of all who know India well is that it is not suited for direct taxation ; the fiscal and economical canons of advanced countries like England are altogether untrue as applied to India. There are few greater dangers which beset British rule in India than this tendency to apply crudely to it the latest deductions of political economy in England. Many of these, which are treated as axioms of universal application, are only true of highly developed communities, where the right of free contract and free competition has lasted for centuries, and where it has produced a robustness of individual type which is wholly wanting in India, as indeed it is in all Asiatic countries. It would be as reasonable to impose by main force upon India our religion, our laws of marriage and inheritance, our political and social institutions, as our economical and financial views. I can hardly sufficiently convey my sense of the danger as well as the injustice of so acting. Systems of law and finance which are quite suitable for the West may become the parents of as much oppression in the East as the worst abuses of despotism. Of all classes of people that endanger our Eastern Empire the worst are the narrow pedants who apply cut-and-dry formulas of European thought without mercy to the complex and widely-different civilization of the East.

INDIAN CLAIM TO GREATER SHARE IN THE GOVERNMENT OF THEIR COUNTRY, REPRESENTATION IN PARLIAMENT, ETC.

I did not find in India so strong a desire for representation in the British Parliament as for a voice in the Indian Government. The natives are much impressed by the difficulty of getting English constituencies to return Indians ; yet many of them feel the great importance of having spokesmen of their own in the House of Commons, and it was a great disappointment when they heard of the defeat of Lalmohun Ghose at Deptford[1] several years ago. Certainly it is most desirable, when Indian questions are under discussion, there

of the people. By limiting the silver coinage and confining it to the government the rupee is now maintained at the artificial value of 1*s.* 4*d.*, though the silver contained in it is only worth 9*d.*!

[1] Some years later Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji entered Parliament and ably represented Indian opinion. He lost his seat, but Sir M. H. Bhownaggree is now a member.

should be representatives of the views held by the native population, as well as those of the official class of Europeans, who are always well represented in the House. It cannot be too well known at home that there is a wide divergence between the official and native opinion of India, and not a little friction between them. The impression of the natives is that the English officials stand between them and their just rights and claims. They think that they keep all the high appointments for themselves and their relatives, and do not carry out the principles of the Queen's proclamation,[1] when the old East India Company was superseded. In that proclamation it was stated that no distinction would be made between race, colour, or creed, but that equal privileges would be given to all classes of Her Majesty's subjects. They allege that this principle has not been acted upon, and that the chief hindrance has been the opposition of the European official class. I am not giving my own opinion on this question, but am stating what I found to be a universal grievance among the natives, and it is one that must be dealt with if we wish to keep India loyal in the future.

Now it is a remarkable fact that no such complaint is made of the British nation. There is a strong belief in their justice and good faith ; and the constant desire of the Indian people is to get access to them, in order to lay their compaints before that august tribunal. They fully believe that if the British Parliament and people were made acquainted with their grievances they would remedy them. It is almost touching to see the simplicity of their faith ; and certainly I do think it is well worthy of consideration whether we could not devise some constitutional way by which India might find legitimate expression in Parliament. The most practical means suggested to me was to give a representative to each of the three Presidencies, through their Universities ; the electoral body would then be the graduates of those Universities, than whom no better exponents could be found of the aspirations of educated India.

In close connexion with this lies another reform urgently demanded by the natives. It is in the constitution of the Indian Council in London. That body, it is well known, was appointed at the time the government of India was taken over by the Crown, in order to assist the Secretary of State for India with a trained body of advisers. It numbers twelve, and is composed of eminent members of the Indian Service on their return home. Originally it seemed well fitted for the end in view. The Secretary of State for India was often inexperienced in Indian affairs, and could exercise no efficient control over the compli-

[1] "It is our further will that, as far as may be, our subjects, of whatever race or creed, be freely and impartially admitted to offices in our service, the duties of which they may be qualified by their education, ability and integrity, duly to discharge.

"In their prosperity will be our strength, in their contentment our security, and in their gratitude our best reward. And may the God of all power grant to us, and to those in authority under us, strength to carry out these our wishes for the good of our people."

cated machinery of Indian administration without the guidance of experts. This Council supplied the needed guidance, and no doubt has prevented many blunders being made; but it has the defect of accentuating the Bureaucratic government of India, and strengthening those very traditions to which the Indian people are opposed. It prevents that free criticism of the methods of government which is indispensable for the removal of abuses. It is too much like an appeal from Caesar to Augustus, from the acting Bureaucracy in India to the retired Bereaucracy in London. All classes in India object to the constitution of the Indian Council. The Europeans allege that it stereotypes past methods of government, even when these are discredited; that it is behind the age, and a drag on modern progress. The natives allege that it is a deadly bar to their advancement, and prevents the Secretary for India knowing the true wishes of the people. Their desire is to abolish it altogether, and to have instead a Standing Committee of Parliament to supervise Indian affairs; if that be not done they wish the admission of a native Indian element on the Council. It seems to me that this last request is the most practicable. It is impossible for the Secretary for India, in our ever-shifting political arena, to have a real hold of the reins without the aid of an experienced Council; but it is equally true that this body can never do full justice to Indian opinion without a native representative element. I understand that in the original draft of the Council, by the then Mr. Disraeli, there were four places reserved for natives of India: if so, it was a piece of true statesmanship, and had it been acted upon, some mistakes we now deplore (such, for instance, as the last Afghan War) would probably not have occurred; but it is not too late to remedy it now. It would be a graceful concession to the Indian population to act thus, and elect a certain proportion of the Council by some means which would give a genuine representation of the best native opinion, and I think that the number of seats placed at their disposal should not be less than four, or say one-third of the Council. I believe it would be of great importance that the Secretary of State for India should have this ready means of acquainting himself with Indian opinion, and, when necessary, of laying it before Parliament.

If these three reforms could be carried out, viz., Representation of natives by election on the Legislative Councils of India; the return of a few members directly from India to Parliament; and the election of a proportion of the Indian Council in London by the natives of India, I believe great good would result. We should have a true knowledge of what India wants, and our policy would be moulded into forms far more acceptable to the people than it is at present. Nor are those reforms in the least revolutionary. They proceed on the old English lines of gradual progress, and in the direction of representative institutions which England, the mother of free parliaments, must act on, all the world over, if she is to be true to herself.

Next to these points—indeed I may say in the same category with them—is the demand that the Civil Service should be opened, on fairer terms, to the natives of India. As matters stand at present it is next

to impossible for natives to pass the examinations in England, which are indispensable for entering the covenanted Civil Service. The age was lowered some years ago, when Lord Salisbury was Indian Secretary, from 22 to 19. There may have been some good reasons for this, but it practically closed the door on native candidates. A small number had made their way into the service at the older age, in spite of the great difficulties of coming to England and struggling through the medium of a foreign language; but when the age was lowered to 19 it was found virtually impossible to get Indian youths pushed through their education in England in time to compete, and so now hardly any natives enter the covenanted Civil Service.[1] It is true that certain appointments are filled up in India from natives, who are selected for fitness and classed among what are styled "statutory civilians," but the higher appointments are reserved mainly for the covenanted Civil Service, which is recruited from England through the channel of these annual examinations. Now, the view of the natives is that if the Queen's proclamation is to be honestly carried out and equal facilities given to all classes of Her Majesty's subjects to rise in her service, there should be entrance examinations in India as well as England.

In that case the youth of India would not have the enormous disadvantage of crossing the seas, contrary to the teaching of the Hindoo religion, and competing through the medium of a foreign tongue. One cannot but feel there is weight in this argument, and it is clear that in some way the entrance must be made easier for the natives. I think few who understand all sides of the question would consider it prudent to open the door so wide that an examination in India would fulfil all the purposes of one in England. Statesmen must face the consequences of their acts, and not act blindly on abstract principles. The youth of India mature more quickly than those of Europe. An Indian lad is developed at 16 as far as a European at 19, and he much sooner reaches his full powers, and has much less outcome in after life. Then the memory and imitative powers are very strong in the Indians; but original faculty and resource in times of difficulty are much weaker. The fact that a handful of Europeans govern India is proof that they are a much stronger race. The easy conquest of the Hindoos by repeated hosts of Mohammedan invaders from Central Asia, show that the race is deficient in martial qualities, and the mere addition of European education does not change their essential character. The quickest of the Indian races are the Bengalees, and they are also the softest, and would be the first to fall under the rule of stronger races if British power were withdrawn.

It would never do to place the government of India in the hands of the weakest races of the Indian Peninsula, simply because at school age they have the quickest memories and can cram more easily than a European. If entrance to the Civil Service were to be on precisely equal terms in India as in England, in course of time the bulk of the

[1] I am glad to say that some years ago the minimum age was raised to 21 and the maximum to 23, and now a larger number of Indian candidates pass.

DARJEELING : VIEW FROM KUTCHERRY HILL.

Photo by Frith & Co., Ltd

posts would be filled by natives drawn from those races which have never been dominant in the Peninsula, and who would not be obeyed by the stronger and more martial races, such as the Sikhs and Mohammedans in the North. This principle of entrance by examination must be cautiously applied, but undoubtedly it must be extended so as to facilitate the admission of a larger number of Indian youth. It was a great mistake lowering the age for examination. An increasing number of natives possessing force of character were entering the Service, and the necessity of coming to England operated as a sort of guarantee for personal energy. The education given in England imparted a higher conception of life and put, so to speak, backbone into the Hindoo character. The successful competitors were not unworthy to enter on the race on equal terms with English-born youth. The very minimum of justice that can now be done is to restore the age to where it stood before. It would be better for the Service in every way that older and more experienced men should enter it. At present the youth who go to India, even after their two years' further education, are little more than boys, and they are suddenly put to duties requiring knowledge of life and experience of men, such as discharging magisterial duties in the Interior. It is one of the crying evils of our system of government that such extensive powers are committed to mere youths. The discipline of human life and experience of the world are more valuable than any literary acquirements for the task of an administrator, and it would be much better that they should enter on their responsible duties somewhat later in life.

MIGRATION TO HILL STATIONS, RURAL ECONOMY, LAND ASSESSMENT, IRRIGATION, ETC.

Before parting from this branch of the subject I must refer to one more complaint brought by the natives against our administrative machinery. I allude to the annual migration of the Supreme Government to Simla during the hot season, and of the local governments to their respective hill stations. This practice only commenced in the time of Lord Lawrence, but is now an integral part of our system of government. The hot weather lasts for six or eight months, and is very trying to Europeans; the atmosphere of the hills is delightful and bracing, and enables white men to enjoy much better health, and to perform more work than is possible on the plains. After the death of Lord Dalhousie, Lord Canning and others, due very much to the effects of climate, it was found that it was not safe to send middle-aged men from England to live in such a climate as Bengal during the hot season, especially when railways had brought the hill stations within easy reach, and the important decision was taken to make Simla the seat of the Viceroy during the hot weather. The local governments soon followed suit, and the chief officials went along with them. Delightful summer abodes now crown the various hill stations of India, and those who resort to them enjoy an improved European climate, even under a tropical sun. Yet this salubrious change is not without grave draw-

backs: it removes the high-class Europeans from touch with the native population, and surrounds the Viceroy and governors during more than half the year with an exclusively official element. At a conference I had with the British Indian Association at Calcutta it was likened to Mr. Gladstone directing the policy of England from the Riviera; the comparison is by no means far fetched. The whole tendency of such a life is to isolate the governing class from the governed; as was once said of the House of Lords, "they are up in a balloon," and out of sound or hearing of common humanity. It also leads to the great multiplication of written reports. Government being removed from contact with the district officers, a voluminous correspondence has to be kept up, and matters often occupy months of discussion which might be settled in a few minutes *viva voce*. I heard on all hands of the enormous increase of report writing in India, and of the pernicious effect it had on the usefulness of the district officers; men who should be moving about among the natives, seeing with their own eyes and hearing with their own ears, were tied to their desks all day, filling up reams of paper with lengthened despatches.

The practice of despatch-writing has grown to be a fine art in India; but, as it has grown, so has the far more important practice of moving about in the districts and keeping touch with the natives declined. In the old East India Company's days there was far less letter writing, and more personal intercourse with the natives. In trying to supervise the action of district officers we have gone to the other extreme and reduced our officials too much to the level of clerks of a Government department. The personal touch of a strong man counts for far more among Asiatics than with us; and, what with the hill stations and endless despatch-writing, the European chiefs are becoming invisible to the natives, and losing that magical power of personal influence which distinguished our early administrators and helped not a little to create the Empire.

I pass now from questions of political and administrative reform to some other aspects of Indian life, the knowledge of which is essential to sound views, even on matters of policy. You may draw any conclusions you like in India if you limit the scope of your induction. You may prove to your own satisfaction that the British Government is the most perfect ever devised by man, as some official optimists actually affirm, or that it is the worst form of oppression ever invented, as others have sought to impress upon me. Either side can quote a certain class of facts which give plausible colour to their conclusions, but each leaves out of view another large class of facts which vitally affect the result. An induction is only sound when it takes in all the phenomena, and the material and social phenomena of India are so different from those of Europe that no opinions are worth anything which are not founded upon a general knowledge of them. The material condition is the first I will refer to, though it is true that at every point it is interpenetrated by the social and even the religious phases of Indian life. India is almost exclusively a country of rural population and agricultural industry—only 9¼ millions of people live in towns of over 50,000 inhabi-

tants—nine-tenths of the people live in rural villages of a few hundreds of population, and subsist almost entirely on the products of the soil. One Indian village is almost an exact copy of another. All the people are divided into castes, and each follows its own pursuit, from father to son. One caste, or profession, is not allowed to pass into another. The "hereditary principle" rules supreme among the Hindoos. It is somewhat different with the Mohammedans, but even they have adopted many of the Hindoo ideas. Two great systems of land tenure divide the soil of India—the Zemindary or landlord type, and the Ryotwary or peasant type. Lord Cornwallis, with the best intentions, stereotyped the Zemindary system in Bengal by giving to the middlemen or quasi-proprietors permanent rights of possession, subject to a quit rent to the Government. He failed to take effectual care of the multitude of small peasants who tilled those estates, and who, under ancient Hindoo law, had occupancy rights akin to what we have conferred on the Irish tenants. Consequently there arose in Bengal precisely the same difficulty which has so long afflicted Ireland. The Zemindars were enabled, by the growth of population and its pressure on the soil, to rack-rent the Ryots, and their incomes have grown to several times what they were in the time of Lord Cornwallis, while their land tax remains the same.

Late in the day the Indian Government, after several ineffectual efforts, sought to remedy this by the "Bengal Ryots Act," recently passed, which confers fixity of tenure and fair rents upon many millions of people, mostly small cultivators. Their poverty may be judged by the fact that six out of ten millions of holdings pay a rent of less than five rupees a year, say *6s. 8d.* at the present rate of exchange. The population is so dense in some districts that it exceeds six hundred people to the square mile, and in some extreme cases even reaches nine hundred; and as all the land is occupied, and the population is steadily increasing and is averse to emigration, the terrible problems that confront us may be imagined. Over the south and west of India the tenure is mostly Ryotwary; that is, there is no landlord class between the Government and the peasantry, but the State deals direct with the small cultivators. The custom is to assess the land for periods of thirty years at a fixed rate, and then to re-value and re-assess according as it has changed in value, or as cultivation has extended. The British Government has for many years favoured this system as one that allows the fruits of their labour to go directly to the cultivating class; yet there are large tracts of country, especially in the North-West Provinces, Punjaub and Oude, where the Zemindary system also exists. In most of these our Government found a powerful landlord class in possession, and thought it best to interfere as little as possible with native customs. Indeed, it may be said with truth that every form of land tenure exists in India, and in some parts the complexity of the system almost baffles description, and I am sorry to be obliged to add, that in all of them pressing agrarian difficulties exist, and it is not an easy matter to say upon the whole which conduces most to the good of the people. At first sight the peasant-proprietor system would seem

This leads me to allude to the primary question of irrigation. Were it possible to apply to all India the admirable system that the Nile provides for Egypt, famines would be unknown and wealth would rapidly increase ; but, according to the excellent Report of the Famine Commission of 1878 (one of the ablest State papers ever issued, and a veritable mine of information on Indian questions), only some 15 per cent. of the cultivated soil of India is irrigated, and much even of that fails in very dry seasons.

One of the first duties of Government, where the rule is a kind of paternal despotism, as in India, is to construct canals and build tanks where the conditions admit of it, and, above all, to give every encouragement to the construction of wells by the peasantry. Much has been done of late years, and is still being done, in the way of constructing canals in Northern India along the great waterways of the Ganges and its tributaries, and most successful works have been made in Madras, especially on the Godavery and Kistna by Sir Arthur Cotton, but after all there is only a small part of the area of India that is capable of so being dealt with, and the more primitive system of tanks and wells must be relied on over most of the country. Nothing strikes a traveller more in the winter or dry weather season than the patches of delicious green vegetation dotted over the parched plains of India. As you approach these green oases, you see in the centre of each a gentle mound, up and down which a pair of bullocks are patiently toiling, drawing a bucket of water out of a deep well, whose mouth is at the top of the mound. A peasant drives the team, and another empties the pitcher into a channel, which conducts it into the surrounding fields, over which it is spread by many little subsidiary canals. A rich mass of foliage marks the presence of the water, and no famine need be feared in that favoured spot unless the well ceases to yield. Millions of such wells exist in India, and for practical use they excel most of the engineering works. In Southern India the tank system generally prevails, which is the primitive mode of collecting the water into reservoirs during the rainy season, where the slope of the land admits of it. Unfortunately in some parts of India, such as the Deccan, the subsoil does not easily afford water for wells, and too little rain falls to be gathered into tanks, and chronic poverty seems to be the inevitable fate of the unhappy peasantry. Those wells and tanks are the chief improvements which the Ryots can make in the soil. They are largely constructed by their own labours in the slack season, when there is little field work going on, and the chief help that Government can lend is to give them full security that they shall enjoy the fruits of the extra produce which irrigation yields. I much doubt whether the periodical re-assessment does not discourage the making of these wells and tanks, from the fear that the Government will tax the increased value so obtained. Certainly that view, whether rightly or wrongly, is largely held by the natives.

President was that able administrator, Sir Anthony McDonnell, contains many excellent suggestions, especially those dealing with irrigation.

The other great means of preventing famines is the spread of railway communication, and here our Government has done noble work in the last thirty years. This work, however, must be done gradually, and so as not to burden the finances of India. For several years the existing railway system was a heavy drain upon the finances; it is now paying interest, and yields a surplus revenue; but we cannot afford to make railways largely in the future without a well-founded expectation that they will pay interest on capital. The strained state of Indian finance leaves no room for making experiments. It is also a mistake to assume, as is too readily done in England, that the railway does away with the danger of famine. The statistics of recent famines show heavy loss of life even in districts traversed by railways. The fact is, when the great bulk of the food crop of a district perishes, and the people have no money to buy imported food, a railway is of no use unless the Government feeds the people gratuitously. It did so with much success in the recent famines, but formerly it encumbered the relief with labour tests and other conditions which deprived it of some of its value.

The effective dealing with a vast famine is one of the most tremendous tasks ever put upon a Government. The great Madras famine affected 50 millions of people, and in spite of an expenditure of 10 millions sterling several millions of people died, and almost the whole stock of animals in many districts.[1] If the Government is to cope effectively with these frightful calamities in the future it must set aside a larger amount of revenue than "the insurance fund" of 1½ millions that is now nominally so appropriated, and this ought to be looked upon as the equivalent of a poor-rate, which does not exist in India. I was informed by many of the natives that one result of the railways was to clear the country every year of its surplus stocks of grain, and so when famine came to render them more helpless than they were before. In the old times the custom was to bury all surplus food in the ground, and to keep it there till a season of scarcity occurred. In some parts of India, such as the Punjaub, it was alleged that several years' supplies used to be kept in stock. All this has been changed, and now a vast export trade in wheat and rice has arisen, and, as railways increase in India, so will it export food more and more largely.

This export of food is not looked upon by the natives with the same unmixed satisfaction that it is by our merchants. It is curious to contrast the opposite points of view from which commercial problems are approached by Europeans and natives. To the English mind exports of food, or any surplus products, appear an unmixed source of wealth. To the Hindoo they too often mean a dangerous depletion of the necessaries of life. Neither view is altogether correct, but there is enough of truth in the Indian conception to make us careful of dogmatising about the economy of a country so totally different from our own.

[1] The last two terrible famines of 1897 and 1900 were even larger and were very successfully handled. The last one cost the Government in all 10 millions sterling, but even then the mortality was great, and 4 millions of cattle died.

eries of great administrators have sought to adapt and improve cient Hindoo law to the modern needs of India; still most serious stakes have been made, and will be made again if we permit modern nglish ideas to be forced on a country centuries behind us in social evelopment.

The general complaint of the natives is that our elaborate British urisprudence is not suited for the simple wants of the village com- munity. It is said greatly to multiply litigation, and to stimulate the fabrication of false evidence. Our European judges admit that it is almost a lottery whether or not a right decision is come to, so hopeless is it to get at the true facts of the case. The old native system was to leave a large discretion to the Panchayat, or council of five village elders, who heard cases on the spot, and administered justice in a rude way, from their knowledge of the locality and of the customs of the people. It is now claimed by many that this ancient tribunal should be re-established, with power of settling cases up to a limited amount; and the suggestion is well worthy of consideration.

Indeed, many of our best administrators are coming to the conclusion that we should restore, where possible, more of the old village customs of the Hindoos. They perceive the harm that has been done by break- ing them up, and the folly of putting a new patch of Western civilization upon the old garments of Indian tradition. We have succeeded best where we have preserved the integrity of the old village community, as is still the case in the North of India. We have done worst where we have broken it up, and substituted dealing with the individual Ryot. Just as each beaver or ant taken out of its nest is helpless and soon perishes, so in some sense does the Hindoo when cut loose from the props that held him up. British law, I fear, has often knocked down those props in the attempt to build up better, with the only result of undermining the foundations of both.

ABUSES OF THE LIQUOR TRADE IN INDIA.

One great reform is urgently demanded by the natives, namely, that the control of the trade in intoxicating drinks should be vested in local bodies, and this leads me to observe that one of the greatest abuses of our Government in India has been the extension it has given to the sale of alcoholic drinks. It ought to be known in England that all classes of the Indian population are by nature extremely temperate; by religion as well as custom they are mostly abstainers, and they re- gard the vice of drunkenness with the deepest abhorrence. If left to themselves they would not have licensed shops for the sale of the vile alcoholic compounds which come from Europe, in comparison with which our own whisky and gin are comparatively wholesome. But the Government in its desire for revenue, and, ignorant of the conse- quences, has let out to contractors, or farmers of the excise, the right of opening liquor shops or "out stills" as they are called, and of late years many of these dram shops have been opened in country districts where the taste did not exist before. This mischief is worst in Bengal,

and I was often told by the natives that groups of drunkards have been formed in many places where the vice was unknown before. The use of strong European spirits is deadly to the natives of India; it kills them far sooner than it does Europeans, and they have so little to spend that it involves them and their families in beggary. Hardly any worse evil could be inflicted on India than introducing a taste for alcohol; it will, if persisted in, do for the Hindoos what opium has done for the Chinese. They become perfectly mad and reckless when they are addicted to this vice. It is a shameful thing that in the matter of morality our so-called Christian Government should fall behind the ethical code of India; yet so it is, and few things will more certainly undermine our hold on India than this defiance of native opinion. I am told that the revenue officials shelter themselves behind the fiction that it is better for Government to license the trade than suffer it to exist in a contraband fashion. I believe the truth to be that in many cases there was no trade or taste for the article till the excise officers planted the temptation amid an unwilling people. No doubt when the taste is once formed there is an irrepressible craving, which will find some means of gratification, and so the Government may excuse itself now for taxing the trade, but there is all the difference between tempting a people to drink to increase revenue, and seeking to curtail consumption by high duties. If the local bodies of India had the control of this trade, on the principal of "local option," now generally assented to in England, they would either stamp it out or hold it in check where extinction was impossible. Native opinion is so pronounced on this matter that it may be trusted to act for the real good of the people, which our paternal Government does not. There is no doubt that the three or four millions drawn from the Excise, and the chronic poverty of the Exchequer, are the motes that blind our eyes to the havoc that is being wrought; and, to go further back, it is the injustice of England in forcing upon India a fiscal system unsuited to that country in the supposed interests of Free Trade. Had India the voice she ought to have in the management of her own affairs, an end to this iniquity would soon be put.[1]

[1] Since these remarks were penned I succeeded in carrying through the House of Commons (on April 30, 1889) the following Resolution:—

> "That, in the opinion of this House, the fiscal system of the Government of India leads to the establishment of spirit distilleries, liquor and opium shops in large numbers of places where till recently they never existed, in defiance of native opinion and the protests of the inhabitants, and that such increased facilities for drinking produce a steadily-increasing consumption, and spread misery and ruin among the industrial classes of India, calling for immediate action on the part of the Government of India with a view to their abatement,"—

which my friend, W. S. Caine, seconded. The result was a remarkable check to the out-still system in India, and a large diminution of liquor licences. Later on we attacked with success the licensing of "opium-smoking dens" and succeeded in getting them condemned and largely suppressed. The excise system is conducted with more regard to Indian opinion now (1902), but there is still great need for improvement. Under the influence of Mr. Caine the Anglo-Indian Temperance

SOCIAL AND RELIGIOUS CUSTOMS A MAIN CAUSE OF POVERTY.

My remarks hitherto have been directed mainly to the defects of our system of government, and the complaints made by the educated natives; but it would not be fair to stop here. Some extremists are trying to make out that British government has been an unmixed evil to India, and pamphlets are being circulated among the natives, some of them written by discontented Europeans, attributing every ill to our oppressive and alien Government. These writings suppress everything that makes for the other side, and omit altogether to state that the chief causes of the poverty of the people are their own social and religious systems, and especially the tyrannical authority of caste. After all, the habits and beliefs of a people have more to do with their welfare than the action of Governments. Some of these habits and beliefs are fatal to all prospects of improvement, so long as they hold the people in their iron grasp. Chief among these must be mentioned the inveterate custom of premature marriages. The first thing a Hindoo father thinks of is to get his child betrothed, which is done usually in infancy and can never afterwards be annulled; and, in the case of a daughter, marriage often actually takes place before the age of thirteen. An unmarried girl of fifteen is hardly to be met with, unless unfortunately a widow, in which case the Hindoo religion forbids re-marriage, and condemns the unhappy creature to life-long ignominy; it may be that her "betrothed" husband died when she was an infant, unconscious of his existence, yet she is treated almost as if she were an accomplice to his death, and is condemned to celibacy and reproach all her life. I am speaking generally of India, but there are exceptions, such as in the Punjaub, where this rule does not apply; but all over India the rule is for mere children to be married. In going through a school, and asking the members of a class of elder boys to stand up if married, I found that almost every one rose to his feet. I need not add, the social results to the community are disastrous. One consequence is a great deterioration of physique, and an excessive multiplication of sickly children. The population is increased unnaturally, and a great portion of it is too feeble to maintain itself. The custom is for all the married sons, with their wives and families, to live in the same household, while their father is alive, and it is not uncommon to find forty or fifty relatives living together under the same roof, and often the greater part of them are a burden upon the small number of bread winners.

The Hindoos are extremely kind in maintaining their poor relations. Nobody thinks of casting off any one nearly related to himself, and so it happens that excessive poverty results from this constant increase of mouths dependent upon others for support. Their marriage customs

Society was formed, which has 300 branches in India and has done much to stir up Indian sentiment in favour of total abstinence, and is a powerful check upon the careless administration of the excise laws. Mr. Caine's influence upon Indian administration generally has been of the greatest possible value.

are a part of their religion ; they have no connexion with commonsense. A starving family marries off its daughters at twelve or thirteen to another starving family, even though they know the offspring must die of hunger. It is held that a man without a son to perform his funeral rites is shut out from bliss hereafter, and it is further held that a son must take upon himself the burden of his father's debts, otherwise he forfeits his hope of future happiness.

Where this system is in full play amid a poor peasantry like that of Bengal, living on patches of four or five acres apiece, with the land overcropped and no uncultivated soil to be had, one can conceive how impossible it is to raise their social state. The custom is to subdivide the land among the sons, so that holdings always grow smaller, and the struggle to live fiercer. Besides, there is an immense amount of subletting, and hosts of middlemen, who squeeze the classes below them as they are squeezed by those above them. Where 600 people are living on a square mile—in some cases 900—solely by agriculture, and when they will not emigrate, it is obvious that no increase can take place without reducing the scale of living. A very heavy death rate is inevitable ; it balances the heavy birth rate, and a low state of vitality prevails. The position of things is like that in the West of Ireland before the potato famine ; the land was always being subdivided more and more as families increased, till the people barely existed on patches of potatoes. So in Bengal they just exist on rice, which is a prolific crop, and feeds as many people per acre, I suppose, as any other crop in the world.

A recent census of India revealed the striking fact that one-third of the population was under twelve years of age ; probably half the population was below eighteen. Were it not for the high death rate, supposed to be about 35 per 1,000, against 22 in England, the Indian population would double every twenty-five or thirty years, and increase in a single century to double the whole population of the globe ! Even as it is, with the abnormal death rate and the great amount of disease, the population is increasing at a rate which will double it in a century, and every sanitary improvement increases this rate. If 294 millions of people have such difficulty in living in India now (1902), one marvels how 500 or 600 millions can live a century hence ! There can be no doubt that one effect of British rule has been to prodigiously increase the population. During the incessant wars of old times large tracts of India were laid waste, and enormous numbers of people were periodically cut off by war, pestilence and famine. We have no reliable statistics of the population of all India in former times,[1] but I have little doubt that the population of India has increased, since the time of Clive, more than in the 2,000 years that intervened since the invasion of Alexander. I see no possible solution of this problem except through a change in the habits and beliefs of the people, and so far only the dawn of that era is perceptible.

But there is another cause of extreme poverty and indebtedness.

[1] The first estimate made of the population of Bengal, Behar and Orissa was 10 millions ; now (in 1891) it is 71 millions.

nounced agnostics, and miss no opportunity of instilling scepticism into the youth under their charge. It is often stated in India that Government colleges turn out clever infidels—men whose whole view of life is merely destructive ; it is from these classes that the strongest opponents to British rule proceed. The native newspapers that are most bitter against us are usually edited by agnostics. That contempt for all authority, which commonly accompanies the destruction of faith, is most deadly in India ; and one of the great problems of the future is to carry the Hindoo mind safely through the transition period when native faiths gradually decay. If that be so effected as to secure a permanent foothold for Christianity—it may be in some form better suited for an Eastern race than in its European dress—England will have done a work in India of which she may be proud ; but if Western thought and science merely act as dissolving acids, and destroy all faith in religion, a terrible chaos may be predicted in India, and its certain revolt from British rule. It may be gravely questioned whether any benefit at all will be conferred on India merely by pulverizing its ancient religions without substituting better. Her old faiths, with all their lamentable defects, yet hold society together ; they enable multitudes of poor and often suffering people to bear patiently the hard incidents of their lot ; they maintain reverence for authority in the breast of millions, and so make it easy for government to be carried on. If all this binding influence be destroyed, and nothing put in its place, the firm texture of Indian life will be broken to shivers, and such a cataclysm result as the world has seldom seen.

Before leaving the subject of education I would say that the natives desire technical schools, after the model of those in Europe, to stimulate native industry, and the Government will do well to respond to this demand. India has lost so much of her ancient hand-made manufactures that it is incumbent on us to give her every chance of retrieving her trade by adopting improved modern processes. No jealousy of her competition with ourselves must hinder us from doing full justice to her aspirations. We must act in this, as in all other matters, as interpreters of the highest and most patriotic wishes of the native community. It is in the long run true self-interest so to do, for such policy alone can bind India to us in chains of genuine affection.

CONCLUSION.

The army that keeps in order this vast country is not large, considering the work it has to do, and it cannot safely be decreased ; but the European portion of it—75,000 men— is very expensive when compared with the small resources of the country ; and Mr. Caine considers that 20,000 of these men should be treated as a reserve for England, and kept at her expense. The universal native opinion is that we should on no account waste their resources on expeditions beyond the frontier ; but they agree in the expediency of the frontier railways, and in the fortification of that natural boundary of extraordinary strength, which nature has given to Hindostan. If India has ever to defend herself

against foreign invasion, our true policy would be to throw ourselves more heartily upon native loyalty than we have done hitherto, and I believe it will respond to the occasion.

I will add, in conclusion, that the future guidance of our Indian Empire will task to the uttermost British statesmanship. New problems will constantly present themselves, demanding rare wisdom and tact to solve discreetly. We have to conduct India successfully through the various stages that separate a subject province from a self-governing colony. It is only at present capable of feeble progression; education and intelligence touch as yet but the fringe of its 294 millions; thick darkness still broods over the deep, and no one would propose dangerous experiments on a people who have never known since the world began any government which was not despotic. What we have to do is to absorb into our system the best native thought of India, and generously to welcome the aid it can give us in administering the country. The time is past for considering India as a close preserve for a profession. The new wine of Indian life must be put into the new bottles of a more liberal policy of rule. Deep interest is felt in India at the promise of a Parliamentary Commission of Inquiry.[1] It is much to be desired that this inquiry should be thorough and impartial; above all, that it elicit fully native opinion. It is much to be desired that, like the Famine Commission, it should hold its sittings in India; but, if that be not possible, ample facility must be given for native witnesses to come before it and tender evidence. Justice would seem to require that eminent natives of India should sit on the commission—there is no difficulty in finding such men. If that be not practicable the next best thing is to give these men the fullest and fairest hearing. Great good will arise if these principles be followed; but, if they are not, much soreness and discontent will be felt in India. In this, as in all things, "honesty is the best policy," and the fullest and frankest investigation should be courted.

In the foregoing remarks my sole object has been truth. I have sought to state both sides of the case fully, even at the cost of some apparent inconsistency. If my remarks seem at times to bear hardly upon our administration of India, it is not because I seek to injure it, but to improve it. We have no need to be ashamed of the work we have done in India; but that work will improve in quality and yield nobler results in future, just in proportion as it is brought within the scope of healthful criticism.

I must apologize to my readers for giving such copious quotations from former writings, but I cannot better condense the results of many years' study of the tremendous issues we have to deal with in India. I have strongly felt that we are only touching

[1] This was not carried out, though promised by Lord Randolph Churchill. Another inquiry of a more limited scope was afterwards held. It dealt with the financial relations of Great Britain and India. An act was also passed giving increased representation to Indians on the legislative councils.

the surface of Indian problems, and it is unfortunate that our country has loaded itself with so many fresh responsibilities in Africa while a world of humanity hangs upon its policy in Asia. Surely the civilizing and elevating of nearly 300 millions of our fellow creatures is work enough for any country, however rich or powerful. I much fear that the vast expenditure on the South African war will divert from India the earnest care and the liberal expenditure of capital she needs. I look upon India as a great undeveloped estate suffering from neglect and absentee landlords. A great portion of the population is never far removed from famine. The mass of the peasantry are deeply and hopelessly encumbered by debt. They pay interest amounting generally to 12 per cent. per annum, but sometimes far more. It was alleged in recent Indian debates in Parliament (1902) that these debts amounted to 230 millions sterling. Probably all the calculations are little more than guess-work, but they will illustrate the terrific character of the problems that confront the Government. It would seem as though some great scheme for liberating the peasantry from the clutch of the moneylenders was the most urgent of all reforms. Agricultural banks are now favoured by the Government. Certainly in Germany they have been of immense value. Were it possible to get rid of old debts by some fair scheme of composition as we do with insolvent debtors at home, and raise the amount of capital required by loans from banks at moderate interest, a prodigious saving would be made to the peasantry. It would mean life and hope to countless millions of helpless and often starving human beings! But it will be said with truth that so long as the ruinous social customs of the Hindoos continue, so long as every marriage or funeral plunges a family into debt, the relief would only be temporary. I grant that this is a tremendous difficulty. The problem is not only material, but moral. It is a case where education and religion are paramount factors. I rejoice to think that our most able Viceroy, Lord Curzon, is fairly facing this question. I cannot refrain from saying that I advocated in Parliament that he should be given a second term of office, so as to be able to carry out a continuous policy for ten years at least. I may mention without impropriety that Lord Cromer stated to me at Cairo last year that his success in Egypt was largely due to eighteen years of continuous administration. This spared him the necessity of forcing the pace, which should never be done with Asiatic peoples. It also arose from keeping his eye fixed on

the main questions that affected the fellaheen—the cultivators of the soil—viz., irrigation and moderate land assessment. It is quite the same in India. We need the long continuous administration of a great reforming Viceroy, who can play the part of a modern Akbar as Lord Cromer has done in Egypt, and Lord Curzon could do in India; and we must concentrate our strength on the elevation of the Indian peasantry by raising their status and fighting those awful famines. Irrigation must be in the future what railways have been in the past—the chief work of the Government. So far we have spent ten times as much on railways as on irrigation. But railways do not grow food. They only carry it from food-bearing districts to those that are famishing. Where the people have no money they must be fed like the ancient Egyptians in the time of Joseph. They become the serfs of the money-lenders. It is far more important to provide water to fight the droughts. This cannot be done with ease as in Egypt: the problem is far more difficult. Most of India is an elevated plateau far above the river courses. Elaborate reservoirs for the storage of water would have to be constructed. In many places artificial lakes would have to be formed, but this could be done in many places, I am assured by eminent engineers. I am glad that Lord Curzon has appointed a commission of engineers to examine the possibilities of irrigation in India, presided over by Sir Colin Scott Moncrieff. I cannot imagine a nobler field for the exercise of the highest talent. I believe vast sums could be wisely and profitably spent in industrial development in India, but it would need a long continuous policy founded upon peaceful progress. There must be an end of these incessant wasteful frontier wars. There must be an end of friction with Russia in Afghanistan. The absorption of time and strength and the waste of resources on the north-west frontier is the great bar to the internal improvement of India. We have to show the Indian people by ocular demonstration that our Government is a paternal one, that its main object is not our own enrichment, but theirs, and that we put first and foremost the wellbeing of its multitudinous races.

We have also by wise and gradual concessions to meet the reasonable demands of the educated Indians for more share in the Government of their own country. We would thereby, in course of time, lighten the drain of remittances and pensions that go to Europe. India is governed much too expensively for so poor a country. We do not realize how much a little extra taxation

means to people almost on the famine line. Not a penny should be needlessly wasted, and native agency is far cheaper than European.[1] I may return to this subject later, but I take this opportunity of stating fully the views I have come to on a subject of paramount importance to our country, and to which I have given much of my life.

[1] A Government return published in 1891–92 shows that the total salaries, allowances and pensions paid to Europeans by the Government of India, from 1,000 rupees (£67) and upwards, amounts roughly to 10½ millions sterling (at 1*s.* 4*d.* per rupee), against 2½ millions paid to natives. This is far too costly a system for so poor a country, and we must try to replace expensive European by cheaper native agency as fast as qualified candidates offer.

CHAPTER XXIII

Session of 1886—The First Home Rule Bill—Death of Alexander Balfour—Visit to Flintshire—General Election of 1886—Autumn Session—Carnarvon Eisteddfod

We sailed from Calcutta early in March by the P. and O. s.s. *Shannon*, and had a splendid passage to Marseilles, with hardly a rough day. We spent a pleasant day at Madras, where I visited Dr. Miller's great college, met the Indian Committee of Congress, and dined at Government House with Sir M. E. Grant Duff. At Colombo we halted for two or three days, which enabled us to make a charming excursion to Candy. Ceylon is a veritable earthly paradise. Incessant showers keep up a luxuriant vegetation, and the blaze of colour from the tropical flowers exceeds anything I have witnessed. The tea-industry was then just being started in place of coffee planting, which had died out in consequence of a disease fatal to the plants. Since then Ceylon has grown into a vast tea garden, which supplies almost as much tea as all the rest of India!

When we reached Port Said I found my letters from home describing the Election for Flintshire and Mr. Gladstone's change of policy towards Ireland. Truth requires me to say that it caused me much anxiety. Irish Home Rule was hardly above the horizon when we left England: now it had become the question of the day. I was most anxious to heal the feud between the Saxon and the Celt, were it possible, but I doubted the wisdom of so sudden a plunge. I resolved to keep my mind open and make no declaration of policy till I heard the exposition of Mr. Gladstone's scheme, and then decide according to the impression it made upon me. It was clear from the information that reached me that Mr. Bright, Mr. Chamberlain, and a large section of our party were not with Mr. Gladstone in his new policy.

We reached Marseilles on April 5, and I took my seat in Parliament on April 8, along with my friend, W. S. Caine, who had just been returned for Barrow. I also found my old friend, W. B. Barbour, member for Paisley. The three of us had often consorted as young men, nearly thirty years before, and studied some of these problems we were now called to adjudicate upon! This was the most epoch-making night witnessed in Parliament since the first Reform Bill. We got seats under the gallery, and found every corner of the House crammed to hear Gladstone introduce his Home Rule Bill. Chairs were placed all along the floor of the House, a thing I never saw before or since, The old man eloquent, then in his seventy-seventh year, spoke for three and a half hours without a moment's hesitation, or failure of voice or language! It was a gigantic effort. My wife was in the gallery beside Mrs. Gladstone, who said at the close of his speech, "What a wonderful old man he is!" We all felt proud of him. We knew that no other man living was capable of such a feat at such an age.

The impression made upon me was favourable to Mr. Gladstone's scheme. It seemed to safeguard Imperial interests and keep the Irish legislature to strictly local duties. It was based somewhat on the Colonial model, but limited in several ways. No representation was provided at Westminster till time showed whether it was necessary or desired. It was a miracle of ingenuity. It was connected with a scheme of land purchase which would enable all the landlords to sell out on favourable terms if they wished; and this was only fair, as in the embittered conflict between landlords and tenants there was little chance of the former getting fair play in a Parliament practically elected by the tenants. This second part of his scheme was introduced subsequently.

Then commenced the longest and weightiest debate I ever listened to. It was a battle of giants. The ablest men in the kingdom threw their whole strength into it. It ranged over the constitutional history of the British Empire; over the historical precedents of foreign countries; over the entire field of jurisprudence and economics. As the debate went on the cleavage between Mr. Gladstone and several of his old colleagues became more marked. Lord Hartington, Mr. Chamberlain, Sir Henry James and Sir George Trevelyan took the lead in repudiating his schemes. It became increasingly evident that a break-up of the Liberal Party was at hand, and I had to settle whether to follow Mr. Gladstone and the main current, or to join the Liberal Unionists. I

had not been in my constituency, and did not know their views. It gradually became clear to me that I should go with the main body. I had been a Liberal all my life. I was deeply interested in Temperance and Social Reform, and looked for that to the Liberal Party. I wholly sympathized with the underlying motive for Home Rule, viz., reparation for past misgovernment of Ireland, and a longing to exchange conciliation for coercion. It was one of those cases which sometimes occur in life when one has only a choice of difficulties. All one can do is to take the course which seems to offer least difficulty. I have never regretted the line I took, though I am free to admit now that it was better Mr. Gladstone's Bills did not pass. That by no means implies that real good was not done by the attempt. The most ample acknowledgment which he and many others of our best men made of past failure in Ireland had an excellent effect in healing that secular feud. I can speak from my knowledge of America. Two visits paid in recent years showed me how greatly Irish discontent had been allayed by Mr. Gladstone's healing policy. I do not say it was removed, or that Irish claims were abandoned; but a far milder attitude prevailed. The desperate murder and dynamite conspiracies had died out. So had all schemes of rebellion, except among an insignificant minority. The atmosphere was far clearer. The heavy thunderclouds had burst, the electricity was largely drawn off. Our American kinsmen of British descent freely acknowledged that England was seeking to pay off her debt to Ireland. Indeed, all over the world a generous mead of admiration was given to the magnanimous effort of the "Grand Old Man." When failure came at last it was clearly seen that the problem was too difficult to solve *per saltum*. Jupiter, according to the old myth, could drag after him all the gods of Olympus, but even he was subject to the Fates. Mr. Gladstone tried his strength against superhuman difficulties—and failed. In failing he shattered for many years the great Liberal Party. Some can see only this lamentable consequence; but the historian a hundred years hence will be more impressed by the moral influence of his heroic attempt to repair immemorial wrongs.

It became increasingly apparent that Mr. Gladstone would not carry his Party, and on June 7 the fateful division was taken, and the Government were beaten by thirty of a majority. No less than ninety-three Liberals voted with the Conservatives, and a dissolution of Parliament was announced as soon as necessary business could be wound up.

To go back a little, we went back to Liverpool for the Easter Recess, which came very late that year, I found my dear friend, Alexander Balfour, very ill. He had taken a house beside my own in Prince's Park. I saw him twice before he went to his home —Mount Alyn, Rossett—to have a dangerous operation performed. I never saw a man on the brink of death so little occupied with himself. He would hardly speak to me about anything except my trip to India and public topics. I venture to transcribe a few lines from my journal as a tribute to the noblest specimen of humanity I ever met with—one whose loss I feel to this day :—

CARLETON, *Thursday, April* 20, 1886.

Attended to-day the funeral of my beloved friend, Alexander Balfour, at Mount Alyn, at 3.30 p.m. He went through a most serious operation this day week, and only lived for two days afterwards. He had a fatal disease which would soon have carried him off in any case, and with much suffering, which he was mercifully spared. I saw him on the Saturday and Sunday before the operation when he was still at Princes Park at a house he had taken for the winter. He was quite cheerful, and interested as usual in all good things, and hardy referred to himself at all. He looked so well I could not realize he was in such danger. He was longing to see me, and I am so thankful I had this opportunity. Had he left Liverpool two days sooner I would have been too late.

He faced death with the most extraordinary calmness. He kept writing and conversing till he had to prepare for the operation. He then asked two minutes to compose his mind, and repeated the words "Father, glorify Thy name."[1] He then took the chloroform and three times repeated the words while half conscious. These were almost the last words he uttered. He was the noblest man I ever knew—absolutely unselfish, full of enthusiasm for all that is good, with a marvellous power over his fellowmen. He did more to raise Christian life and work in Liverpool than any man in our time. There was hardly a good cause he was not connected with, and of some he was the chief originator and supporter. His chief works were the Y.M.C.A., the Seamen's Orphanage, the Mersey Mission, the Council of Education, the Sheltering Home for Emigration of Poor Children, and every department of Temperance and Mission work. I was allied with him in many things, and felt his noble and inspiring influence as a great motive power for good. I will feel my life poorer now that he has gone, and Liverpool will not be the same place to me.

A wonderful concourse of people attended the funeral: perhaps 1,000 in all, by special train—representatives of everything good in Liverpool.

His charity was boundless, and multitudes mourn his loss.

During the Recess I made my first visit to Flintshire, and received an enthusiastic welcome at Rhyl, Mold and Buckley. I found

to my delight that the decision I had made to follow Mr. Gladstone had the strong approval of my constituents. From this time forward till his death I had the honour of representing Mr. Gladstone in Parliament, and my occasional visits to Hawarden were a source of great pleasure to me. I found that nowhere was our great statesman so much loved as in his own home and among the humble Welsh people that dwelt in the village, though the great bulk of them were Protestant Dissenters, and far removed from the High Church views of their ex-Premier. The bond that united them was something deeper than Church connexion: it was a common devotion to the Christian religion taught in different forms, but one in essence. During all the years I visited Hawarden, and represented the strong Protestant Nonconformists of Wales, I never experienced the least friction in my intercourse with the Gladstone family.

I made my first speech in this Parliament on the Indian Budget, in June, and presented the case of the natives of India, very much on the lines indicated in the paper I have quoted. This was the first of a long series of speeches delivered during fourteen years. Though anticipating a little, I may add that when the new Parliament met for a short term in August I moved an amendment to the address on the subject of the Burmese War, urging that the whole cost should not be thrown on India, as I had found strong opposition there to the annexation of Upper Burmah. I failed to carry the motion, but succeeded in raising a useful debate.

The General Election took place in July, just eight months after the preceding one! I was not opposed, and so got a welcome opportunity of a trip to the Highlands and some fishing in Sutherlandshire. I watched from that quiet retreat the stormy waves of furious controversy all over the country. Nothing was debated but Irish Home Rule, and the result was a crushing defeat for Mr. Gladstone. Conservatives and Liberal Unionists returned 391; Liberals, 191; Parnellites, 84. Lord Salisbury took office, with that erratic genius, Lord Randolph Churchill, as Leader of the House of Commons.

A short meeting of Parliament took place in August and September, and the curious spectacle was witnessed of four Liberal Unionists sitting on the Front Opposition Bench alongside of Mr. Gladstone, yet in all points voting and speaking with the Tories. I have always thought this a very unfair arrangement, and most inconvenient to the leaders of the Opposition, who have frequently

to confer with each other on confidential matters. It lasted through the whole of this Parliament. I got away from London on September 1 and went to Craigieburn. I made my first acquaintance with the great National Fête of Wales, the Eisteddfod, at Carnarvon, in that month. What the Olympic games were to Greece, or the gladiator shows to Ancient Rome, or "the Derby" is to London, this great national festival is to Wales. Who can sufficiently estimate the refining influence of the high-class music and poetry that are the chief features of these entertainments? They are the product of the deeply religious life of Wales, and a certain spiritual element pervades these gatherings, which differentiates them from all other national celebrations I have witnessed. I presided at one of the great meetings in the pavilion, which held some 10,000 people, and was duly installed as a "Druid," or bard, within the old castle where Edward II. was born; but I fear the mantle of Taliesen did not fall on me! I have attended many local Eisteddfods since then. All will agree that in choir-singing and band-music the Welsh come first in the United Kingdom.

CHAPTER XXIV

Distress in Liverpool—First Visit to Mr. Gladstone at Hawarden—Publication of Scandalous Evidence in the Press—Visit to Cannes

WE had great distress in Liverpool this winter. Our Sunday meetings were crammed with starving people, to whom we distributed bread. All over the country extreme depression of trade continued. The harvest had been bad, owing to the wet, cold season. Prices were also very low, and in Ireland distress was most acute. Parnell brought forward a Relief Bill in the Autumn Session, which was thrown out. All on our side voted for it. Evictions became very numerous; bitter discontent existed; agrarian crime increased, and the outlook was very dark. Indeed, I have seldom passed through a more dreary time. I again visited my constituency, and went over it thoroughly. I took Hawarden in my route, and paid my first visit to Mr. Gladstone, whom I represented to the close of his life. As this was the first of several visits, and as Mr. Gladstone's beautiful private life is now revealed, there can be no objection to my copying this extract from my journal:—

CARLETON, *Saturday, October* 30, 1886.

The most interesting event of the past fortnight was my visit to Hawarden last Wednesday. I had engaged to speak at the village that evening, and Mr. Gladstone sent me an invitation to stay at the Castle. I had a good meeting, and Mrs. Gladstone was present. W. H. Gladstone, the eldest son, took the chair. Afterwards we went to the Castle and had supper, and then I went to the library and joined Mr. Gladstone, who conversed with me very pleasantly for half an hour, then took up his book. I think it was Homer, in the original. Next morning I went to Hawarden Church to morning prayers at 8.30, and found Mr. Gladstone and some members of his family there. We breakfasted at 9.30, a small party, and I was the only gentleman besides Mr. Gladstone, and we had again a good deal of pleasant conversation, Mr. Gladstone ranging over some scientific speculations on the

rays of light, and on Welsh early religious history ; and then I drew him on to India, and gave him some of my impressions. After breakfast he took me into his sanctum—a charming little library, full of books which he had arranged with much skill—some 10,000 volumes. Many of the books bear his markings. He is an extraordinary reader. Mr. Drew told me he does little else from 4.30 (when he returns from his afternoon walk) till bed time. His mind is still running on Irish history, and the enormity of English offences towards that country. But he speaks as if he did not wish to take much more part in public life, as is natural at the age of 77. I left the Castle at a quarter to twelve, with a pleasant remembrance of my visit to the greatest living Englishman. It was a charming house, the members of the family living together in harmony and love. Mrs. Gladstone made a good hostess. The Castle is a fine old mansion, and the grounds and park are beautiful.

I had an arduous time in Liverpool this winter with social questions of various kinds. I must allude to one of a somewhat painful nature. The public press had been teeming with some nauseous divorce cases in high life. Never had it gone to such lengths in reporting corrupting details. Indeed, since the awful disclosures of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, a year or two before, all restraint was thrown off by a section of the press, and filth was poured on the public in a way that would not have been tolerated in the earlier part of the century. It caused me great pain. It was impossible not to observe its depraving influence, especially amongst the young. Mere children became familiar with loathsome vice, and a sort of miasma brooded over the land. In my travels in many countries I never saw anything like it. It seemed to me that if we could not stop this pestilential exhalation our vital tone would decay, and the nation would rapidly decline. But there was a kind of superstitious regard for the liberty of the press and the advantage of full publicity, which was like the fetish worship of "Free Trade" pleaded against Lord Shaftesbury's Factory Acts, and all Temperance legislation. I obtained the consent of the Mayor of Liverpool to call a meeting of the magistrates to memorialize the Government. We had a large and influential meeting, and adopted with practical unanimity the following resolution :—

That this meeting of magistrates, sitting at Liverpool, having been specially convened by the Mayor to consider the injury done to the public morals by the publication of detailed reports of divorce cases, is of opinion that it is desirable that the publication of such details should be forbidden by law, and that the same rule should apply to all cases of an indecent character.

This was sent to the Mayors of several of the principal cities, and started movements in them. When Parliament met, I urged upon members the need of strong action, and found the feeling almost universal that something must be done. I drew out a memorial, which was widely signed. I think we obtained 250 signatures. Then we had a meeting in one of the large committee rooms, at which Sir John Mowbray acted as chairman, and we passed an important resolution to the Lord Chancellor. Lastly, I succeeded in raising a debate in the House, and received hearty support from Sir Richard Webster, then Attorney-General, Mr. (now Sir Robert) Finlay, and the late Sir Frank Lockwood. Indeed, the feeling of the House seemed to be unanimous.

During these discussions I had a crowd of reporters constantly interviewing me, and had the happiness of noting a great change in the conduct of the press. Public opinion is a mighty power in a free country, and far more good was done by the appeal to the conscience of the press than by legislation. My impression is that the judges claimed power after this to prohibit indecent details; but however that may be, there is no doubt that a wonderful change for the better has taken place in the conduct of respectable journals. I venture to append a short report of my speech,[1] for this subject may arise again, and the knowledge of what has been done may be useful in future. London "Society" was at that time in a very bad condition. Possibly it was not so much its increased depravity, as the increased publicity; but however that might be, many felt an anxious concern for the fate of our country. It was admitted by all that since the early Victorian period a great descent had taken place in the drama, in light literature, and in the cheap popular magazines. It was the beginning of a long conflict with these evils, in which I became involved, of which more anon.

I should say that in Liverpool I received great support from Bishop Ryle; also from Christopher Bushell, who died not long after. Mr. Bushell was a citizen of admirable public spirit, who co-operated with Mr. Balfour like a brother. His memory is held in honour to this day.

Before Parliament met in 1887 I took a short trip to Cannes, partly for my wife's health. It had become worse of late years. The fatal ailment which ultimately carried her off was then at work, though unsuspected. The medical men misunderstood the symp-

[1] See Appendix (IX.).

toms, and remedies were not applied in time; but it is probable that nothing would have affected the issue. It was an obscure case of "Bright's disease," which is practically incurable. In our earlier married life she was much stronger than I, but gradually she grew weaker as I grew stronger. Nothing did her more good than the bright sunshine of the Riviera, and for several years we took a run to the South of France in January before the meeting of Parliament. We always had lovely weather at that season, and the contrast was often magical with the weather we left behind. This winter we had incessant fogs and cold sunless skies at home, and the brilliant sunshine at Cannes was like an electric bath. My health was also run down, and we both returned home braced up for the work of the Session.

CHAPTER XXV

Session of 1887—The Parnell Commission—The Gold and Silver Commission—Tithe Agitation in Wales —Mr. Gladstone at Swansea

LORD SALISBURY'S Government was firmly placed in power by a large majority; but that meteoric statesman, Lord Randolph Churchill, had resigned his post, and the Leadership of the House of Commons passed to W. H. Smith. No one in my time has more successfully led the House. He wholly lacked genius, or indeed high talent of any kind, but he was an admirable man of business, with excellent temper and unflagging industry, and he carried Parliament through very troubled times with much success. He was indeed the incarnation of commonsense, and I venture to put that gift far before genius where the Government of a nation is concerned. Mr. Arthur Balfour became Chief Secretary for Ireland, and in that difficult post attained great success, and from being a somewhat dilettante politician, proved himself worthy of the great position he has since risen to. The first business of the Session was one of the endless attempts to put down obstruction by new Rules of Procedure, and was followed by the passing of the Irish Crimes Act, which caused intensely bitter and prolonged debates. The object of it was to obtain convictions in cases of agrarian crime, and to put down the practice of boycotting. In many parts of the country the law of the Land League was supreme, and local juries would not or dare not convict even upon the clearest evidence. So this Bill set up courts of resident magistrates to try such cases, and, for more serious cases, changed the venue of the trial when intimidation was rampant. It was not denied that this system practically subverted what in Great Britain was regarded as the constitutional bulwarks of liberty, but it was argued that by no other means could crime be repressed and the law upheld. It was indeed analogous to the adoption of martial law in time of war, and was founded on the old maxim,

"*Salus reipublicae lex suprema.*" I have seldom seen party feeling more exacerbated than at this time. Mr. Gladstone threw his whole weight into opposition to the Bill, and after many weeks of bitter debate the Government at last resorted to closuring the discussion by setting a time limit, and the final sections of the Bill were passed without discussion. The example thus set was followed by the Liberal Party when in power in 1893, and a large part of the Irish Home Rule Bill was similarly passed without debate, under the closure of a time limit. In each case the opposition accused the Government of gagging debate: in each case the excuse was that debate had become veiled obstruction, and that no legislation could be passed without the power of stopping floods of irrelevant talk.

I succeeded before Easter in raising a debate on the emigration of pauper children, and was ably seconded by William Rathbone and Sir Edward Russell, who bore testimony to the great good done by our work in Liverpool. After Easter fresh fuel was added to the bitterness of party conflict by the amazing indiscretion of the London *Times*, in publishing what it styled a "facsimile" of a letter by Parnell, justifying assassination, and it was followed by violent attacks on the Irish Nationalists generally. These were made the subject of a long and envenomed debate on "breach of privilege," which lasted several days. Parnell defended himself with much dignity, and satisfied me that the letter was a forgery. He asked for a select committee to examine into the charges. This was refused by the Government, who suggested a libel action before the High Court. The upshot was the appointment of a commission the following year to try these charges. Three most eminent judges were appointed, and the *Times* was represented by the Attorney-General, and Parnell and his associates by Sir Charles Russell, then at the height of his fame (afterwards Chief Justice of England as Lord Russell of Killowen). It was one of the most memorable state trials, and ended in the clear proof of a forgery so far as the facsimile letter of Parnell was concerned. The other charges against the Irish members were also disproved so far as complicity with murder was concerned, but they were found guilty of instigating intimidation and boycotting. The general effect of this trial was to clear the air considerably, and to produce a reaction in favour of Mr. Parnell and his supporters, who were held to be innocent of the odious crimes charged against them.

I should add that during this Session an important commission was appointed, with Lord Herschell as chairman, entitled "The Gold and Silver Commission," to investigate the extraordinary change that had taken place in the relative value of the two metals, and its disturbing effect on trade. I was twice examined before it, and, after sitting a long time and taking much evidence, it practically divided into two equal sections, of which one might be designated monometallist and the other bimetallist. The long-continued commercial distress and the vigorous propaganda of the Bimetallic League were making a great impression on public opinion. Had it not been so long delayed it is possible that England might have headed a confederacy of Europe and America to restore the old bimetallic system; but what was possible in 1877–78 had become impossible ten years later, and as we shall see further on, the only result, and that a very important one, was the practical adoption of the bimetallic system in India. I delivered about this time the address at the Manchester Athenaeum, reproduced in the Appendix (III.), which I reckon is the most succinct statement of the cause that I have made.

I spent the Whitsuntide recess in Wales, where a strong agitation against payment of tithes was in progress. I was then confronted with a class of questions that were new to me, and it took some years of education before I got the proper focus for Welsh politics. At that time the payment of tithes was placed direct on the farmers, of whom the great majority were Nonconformists, and they felt it a great grievance that they should maintain a Church they did not belong to. It was a time of intense agricultural depression. Many of them were extremely impoverished. They paid quite too high rents, without the power of getting legal abatements, as was now the case in Ireland. They indeed resembled in many respects the Irish peasantry without their safeguards. The great majority were tenants at will, having no legal right to their own improvements. They were Liberals and Dissenters, while their landlords were Tories and Churchmen. They were under a veiled pressure —at least on some estates—to forsake their religion and political connexions so as to get better terms. In refusing to pay tithe they took the line of least resistance. Their landlords sharply evicted if rent was not paid, but it was difficult for the parson to distrain in parishes where nine-tenths of the population were outside his fold. Of course it is true that the tenants took their farms subject to the obligation to pay tithe as well as rent, and

both were legal obligations. I found it impossible to justify non-payment of tithe, yet I felt much sympathy at bottom with the hard condition of the Welsh peasantry—bled almost to death by the impossible demands upon them, and struggling to support their own chapels whilst forced to contribute to what they looked upon as an alien and anti-national Church. I used my influence against all violence, but heartily acquiesced in the justice of the demand for Disestablishment and Disendowment, and the application of the tithes to national purposes as soon as the life interests of existing holders were provided for. This agitation went on for years, and was met by an Act which put the obligation to pay tithes on the landlords, and allowed them to add it to their rent. This expedient practically put an end to the strike against tithes; but the deep feeling of injustice remains and will continue so long as the Church of a minority, and that the wealthiest portion of the community, claims for itself all the national endowments.

I witnessed a most interesting function at this time in Swansea. Sir Hussey Vivian (afterwards created Lord Swansea) entertained Mr. Gladstone at his beautiful residence, Singleton Abbey, close to Swansea, and most of the Welsh members were present. I stayed with old Mr. Dillwyn, one of the sturdiest Radicals in Parliament, and we witnessed a huge procession of Welsh miners and tinplate workers pass the Abbey in front of Mr. Gladstone, singing Welsh hymns and national melodies. They walked eight abreast, and took four hours to pass the venerable statesman. It was computed that 35,000 men walked in procession, and Mr. Gladstone addressed them in the open air for fifty minutes, with clear resonant voice. A great banquet was given in the evening, at which twenty Welsh members were present. Most of them are now dead, including the venerable Henry Richard, the father of the Welsh party. There Mr. Gladstone delivered another of his rousing speeches. The whole affair might be called a rehearsal of the still greater commemoration of our beloved Sovereign's Jubilee, which took place the following month. Wales paid its tribute to the greatest Englishman of the century, and the British Empire to its greatest Sovereign.

CHAPTER XXVI

The Jubilee of 1887—Evening Continuation Schools—Tour in Germany—The German System of Education

THE first of the Jubilee meetings was held at St. Margaret's Church on Sunday, May 22, when the thanksgiving sermon was preached by Bishop Boyd Carpenter to 400 or 500 members, who marched arm-in-arm from the House of Commons, headed by Speaker Peel, followed by W. H. Smith and Mr. Gladstone. The sermon contained eloquent passages, but lacked, as I thought, the element of earnest pleading for a higher and purer national life. I felt all through the Jubilee celebrations that there was too much of national pride and self-laudation: too much of the spirit of Nebuchadnezzar when he said: "Is not this great Babylon, that I have built for the house of the kingdom by the might of my power, and for the honour of my majesty?" We all know the reply of the "Heavenly Majesty": "There fell a voice from heaven saying, O king Nebuchadnezzar, to thee it is spoken; Thy kingdom is departed from thee" (Daniel iv. 30, 31).

Far be it from me to imply that our gracious Sovereign had even a particle of that vaunting spirit. No one ever set a finer example of humble duty based upon reverence for the Most High. But it is beyond doubt that the two Jubilees of 1887 and 1897 flaunted the greatness of the British Empire in the eyes of the world, and did not a little to stir up that foreign envy and jealousy which flamed to such a height in the South African War. It also produced a burst of national pride which in all ages has usually been the precursor of humbling reverses. I believe in the inexorable character of the moral law, and one of its basal principles is that "pride goeth before a fall."

But, apart from this, nothing could be more successful than the celebrations in June, and especially the wonderful gathering of 10,000 of the most eminent citizens of the Empire in Westminster

Abbey on June 21. There our beloved Queen, surrounded by forty of her descendants and relatives, paid her homage to the King of kings. Sovereigns and princes from all parts of the world assembled to do her honour. Among them was that most noble of Royal personages, as Mr. Gladstone described him, the Crown Prince of Germany, afterwards the Emperor Frederick, the husband of our Princess Royal, who seemed, to my eye, the finest-looking man in that princely pageant, yet doomed to an early death from an incurable disease.

> Nec puer Iliaca quisquam de gente Latinos
> In tantum spe tollet avos, nec Romula quondam
> Ullo se tantum tellus jactabit alumno.
> Heu pietas, heu prisca fides invictaque bello
> Dextera! Non illi se quisquam impune tulisset
> Obvius armato, seu cum pedes iret in hostem,
> Seu spumantis equi foderet calcaribus armos,
> Heu miserande puer! si qua fata aspera rumpas,
> Tu Marcellus eris.

I have often thought that great national rejoicings are times of peril. They too easily glide into occasions of boasting and revelry, and sometimes of lamentable catastrophes, as happened at the coronation of the Czar at Moscow, when some thousands of spectators were trampled to death. London was filled with prodigious crowds; the streets were lined with scaffolding; the illuminations at night were wonderful. The streets were almost impassable from immense crowds, yet all went off well. No accident occurred to mar the festivities. The weather was splendid, only too hot, and the great company dispersed like the crowds that came to the dedication of Solomon's temple: "Joyful and glad of heart for all the good things that the Lord had done to [Victoria] his servant, and to his people."

I visited the great Naval Review at Spithead the following month, when we passed between two lines of battleships four miles long—greatly surpassed by the next one, held ten years after. One of the most interesting functions was a garden party to the Indian Princes, given at Coombe Warren, where I met my Hindoo friend, Baij Nath, of Agra, then Chief Justice of Indore, a man of beautiful spirit and probity of character. The Irish Land Bill passed this Session, which reopened rents fixed by the Land Commission, on the ground of the great fall of prices, and did something to relieve the strain of agrarian distress in Ireland. A Tech-

nical Education Bill was introduced in the autumn, and I urged that it should be supplemented by a system of evening continuation schools, and that means should be taken to get the mass of the children into these schools for at least two years after leaving the day school. I wrote a long letter to the *Times*, which was published as a pamphlet. I began to work at this time with Mr. George Howell, M.P., to rouse the Trade Unions to the great dangers of our position. They had hitherto stood in the way of technical education, fearing it would interfere with their monopoly of skilled trades. Governments were afraid to take a strong line in face of their opposition. Mr. Howell was one of the ablest and most honest working-class representatives in Parliament. He thoroughly understood Trades Unionism, and had the confidence of its leaders. He distributed for me an immense amount of literature among the *élite* of the working classes, pointing out how far we were behind Germany and Switzerland, and how certainly England's industrial condition would decline unless we gave technical education far more widely to all classes. The effect in course of time was very marked. The resolutions passed at their annual congresses became more and more favourable to evening schools on technical lines. We got the support of large bodies of artisans for my Continuation School Bill, which I introduced annually for ten or fifteen years, but I never got a good place in the ballot. Its provisions were, however, adopted piecemeal to a considerable extent. The whole style of the evening school was changed. From being a place of pedantic drudgery it became bright and interesting, with practical science, drawing, manual training, rural economy, gymnastics and music. The result was, as I have already stated, that the attendance rose from 30,000 to 500,000 and I hope it will ultimately reach a million. I should add that no one did more to popularize the system than Dr. Paton, of Nottingham, from whom I derived much of my inspiration, and who drafted with me the Continuation Schools Bill. I attended a great meeting at Nottingham that winter, where many eminent men took part. Though anticipating a little, I may say that I devoted that autumn and winter largely to educational questions, including a trip to Germany, and a series of visits to the day and evening schools of Liverpool on our return home.

I left London at the end of August for a Continental tour with my wife and son, and enjoyed a few weeks in Switzerland, and then carried out a tour through Germany to examine its system of edu-

cation. I had the aid of my friend and former secretary, Mr. Capper, who thoroughly understood German, and we started from Zurich, where we went through its splendid polytechnic and secondary schools. No part of Germany surpasses Zurich, or indeed the Swiss Protestant cantons generally, for high education. In some of these little republics young men are required to attend classes in the winter evenings to the age of nineteen, where such subjects as the duties and rights of citizens are taught to them. Switzerland is a wonderful example of what a poor country with few natural resources may become, when patriotism, thorough education and great industry are combined. Our course lay through Stuttgard, Nuremberg, Chemnitz, Dresden and Berlin. We met everywhere the utmost courtesy and kindness. There was then none of that lamentable Anglophobia which has since arisen. I was greatly struck by the thoroughness of the German system, by the absence of cram, by the patience of the teachers to carry the intelligence of the pupils along with them, and the universal training of hand and eye; also by the much greater length of the school course, and by the universal system of evening schools and classes.

I was equally impressed by the moral effects, such as the absence of the ragged and squalid class which abounds in our British towns. I was entertained hospitably at Berlin by a prominent Liberal of the Reichstag, and met several members in pleasant and friendly intercourse. In those days German Liberals looked to England as the home of liberty and constitutional government. All that has since sadly changed for the worse. I wrote a full report to the *Times*, which was widely circulated in a pamphlet to school boards, trade unions, etc., and afterwards I sent an article to the *Contemporary*, from which I venture to quote the following extracts:—

> It was by studying the systems of Germany and Switzerland that I was led to feel the crying necessity for continuation schools in this country. I may be pardoned for repeating what I have already often stated in Parliament on this subject. No one can truly feel the almost infinite possibilities of national improvement until he knows what those countries have done for their youth. I found in Germany that almost everywhere the age for compulsory attendance at the day school was fourteen for boys, but girls were sometimes exempted at thirteen, and the attendance was so regular that at some schools I visited, 97, 98, and even 99 per cent. of the whole children on the register were present! In our country the average attendance last year was 77 per cent. Then

the school programme was much more extensive than ours, often embracing one foreign language, besides admirable and universal mechanical drawing. The teaching profession was much more highly trained than ours and stood far higher in social consideration, and the pupil-teacher system was unknown, all instruction being given by highly-trained teachers, mostly male. The schools were splendid buildings, and always contained a fine gymnasium, where the children of both sexes were systematically trained by scientific masters. All these facts are so well known that it is almost a waste of time to recapitulate them. The admirable report of the late Matthew Arnold is a masterpiece of luminous exposition of both the German and the French systems. But the point which I wish more specially to emphasize is this: notwithstanding that the average age of leaving school is two years later in Germany than in England, the obligation does not cease then, but in most of the German States there is an elaborate system of continuation schools for older children generally; these are usually held in the evening, when attendance is required for some years after leaving the day school. In some of the States, such as Saxony, this attendance is compulsory for three years; in others it is voluntary, but generally enforced by public opinion, and the strong tendency of opinion is to make it universally obligatory. These schools are often technical in character, and are suited for the various industries of the locality. Indeed, technical training has in Germany reached the proportions of a great national organization. I do not propose, however, to go into this question, which lies rather outside the province of this paper. Continuation schools are not intended to be strictly "technical schools"; these are designed specially for young persons of sixteen and over, who wish to qualify for some special branch of industry, and they need to be spontaneous in their character, and also much more scientific than the elementary continuation school. I may, however, interpolate this observation, that we shall never get any large number of the children of the working classes to enter technical schools at sixteen or over, unless we carry on the thread of education after they leave school at twelve or thirteen. If an entire break of three or four years occurs, not one in twenty will ever again submit to the strain of education.

What struck me most in Germany was the marvellous effect of their continuous system of education on the national life. It has almost extirpated the class of pauper and ragged children. I saw in none of the German cities the analogue of what we have in England, viz., hordes of street Arabs, brutal "corner men" or "hooligans," or the genus "rough," which swarms in most large English towns. I did not see, during some weeks' travel, a single ragged or begging child; indeed, the class did not seem to exist to any appreciable extent. There is no "submerged tenth" in Germany corresponding with that in England, meaning by that a squalid mass of destitute and for the most part degraded human beings. There is much poverty in Germany. Wages are much lower than in England. Pinching and economy prevail to an extent unknown here, but there is always self-respect, and nearly always good education, thrift and industry. Un-

doubtedly the main cause is their admirable system of education; the children are not allowed to relapse into savagery during the critical time between childhood and manhood. They are conducted over that hazardous stage by a series of ladders, and thus it comes to pass that Germany, though a poor country, has escaped the worst social evils that afflict Great Britain, and has by its national patriotism achieved a wonderful position in the European commonwealth.

From Berlin we visited Potsdam and saw the Emperor William's summer palace of Babelsberg, and the little camp bed where the old veteran in his ninety-first year slept! We saw the furniture made by the hands of the Royal Family, for every member had to learn the use of tools. *O si sic omnes!* Even then the Crown Prince showed signs of the terrible disease which was to cut him off the following year, after wearing the German Crown for three short months!

We returned home by way of Amsterdam and the Hague, Flushing and Queenborough.

I was busy that winter chiefly with educational questions; also with Temperance and Social work, and introduced to the Home Secretary a ladies' Temperance deputation to present the famous Jubilee petition to the Queen, signed by 1,136,000 women, and weighing six cwts.! one of the largest petitions, if not the largest, ever presented. I sometimes wonder if in any cause so much labour has been spent with so little legislative result as in the cause of Temperance!

CHAPTER XXVII

Session of 1888—The Indian Famine—The Liquor Laws in India—Demoralizing Literature—Henry Drummond at Grosvenor House—Pan-Presbyterian Alliance Meetings—I acquire Orchill, Perthshire, for an Autumn Residence—The Ashbourne Act

WHEN Parliament met in February, 1888, I moved an amendment to the address on the subject of Indian finance. The salt tax had recently been raised, causing great discontent and suffering, and the inquiry promised into the Government of India by Lord Randolph Churchill two years before had not been carried out. The terms of that promise were as follows:—

> The time which has elapsed since I assumed the direct government of India renders it desirable that the operation of the statutes by which the change was effected should be carefully investigated. I commend this important matter to your earnest attention.

This statement was commented upon by the Leader of the Opposition (W. E. Gladstone), as follows:—

> I am of opinion that Her Majesty's Government are eminently right in asking the House to appoint the Committee. I trust that it will be a carefully selected Committee, and that it will be efficient in proportion to the greatness of the subject; and that it will devote itself to that subject with a zeal and diligence such as we have known in former years and former generations.

I specially dealt with the terrible pressure of the salt tax. I said:—

> The salt tax at 2½ rupees per maund, to which it is now raised, amounts to sixteen times the prime cost of the native product. Think of a tax of 1,600 per cent. on a necessary of life. I am told that such is the dearth of prime salt in some parts of India, and such is the poverty of the people, that they have been known to mix earth containing saline particles with their food. Let me quote the opinion of Lord Lawrence on this subject:—

"When I was a magistrate many men accused of smuggling salt were brought before me; and I had to try them and punish them under the Customs law. I thought it was a very hard and very severe system. Here are the people in India paying an excessive price for salt. I think it is an enormous rate, and not only does it limit the consumption as regards human beings, but, I think, it limits the consumption very much as regards cattle, and I believe myself that a great deal of the loss of cattle from murrain in India has arisen from want of salt."

I believe it remains unchanged to this day. I continued as follows:—

I will boldly affirm that if India had popular representation its taxation would be arranged in a very different way. The 200 millions (now 231 millions) of British subjects in India would, with one voice, reimpose the cotton duties, which in no way press on the people, and are scarcely perceptible. India imports over 40 millions of manufactured goods and metals; a duty of 10 per cent. on this would produce 4 millions, and would at once place the Indian Exchequer in affluence. A duty of 5 per cent. would produce 2 millions, and meet the existing deficit. I know how unpalatable this suggestion will be to my Manchester friends, but justice compels me to say that, though interested in the trade myself, I will contend that our duty is to consider solely what is good for India. Of course Indian machine manufactures would have to be taxed *pro rata*, to avoid all appearance of protection. I fear, however, no English Government will have courage enough to do what is right in this matter unless we decide on giving to the native population of India an efficient voice in the government of their own country.

Since then a slight import duty has been laid on certain classes of goods balanced by an equivalent duty on Indian home manufactures. I called attention to the Queen's Proclamation made on taking over the Government of India from the old East India Company, drawn, I believe, by her own hand (see p. 206), and I concluded with the noble words of Macaulay, spoken in 1833, which may well be taken as the spirit that should animate our Government to-day:—

The destinies of our Indian Empire are covered with thick darkness. It is difficult to form any conjectures as to the fate reserved for a State which resembles no other in history, and which forms by itself a separate class of political phenomena; the laws which regulate its growth and its decay are still unknown to us. It may be that the public mind of India may expand under our system till it has outgrown the system; that, by good government we can educate our subjects into a capacity for better government; that, having become instructed in European knowledge, they may in some future age demand European institutions. Whether such a day will ever come I know not. But never will I

attempt to avert or to retard it. Whenever it comes it will be the proudest day in English history. To have found a great people sunk in the lowest depths of slavery and superstition, to have so ruled them as to make them desirous and capable of all the privileges of citizens, would indeed be a title to glory all our own. The sceptre may pass away from us. Unforeseen accidents may derange our most profound schemes of policy. Victory may be inconstant to our arms. But there are triumphs which are followed by no reverses. There is an empire exempt from all natural causes of decay. These triumphs are the pacific triumphs of reason over barbarism; that empire is the imperishable empire of our arts and our morals, our literature and our laws.

I had another opportunity the following month of speaking on an Indian debate raised by Mr. Slagg, member for Manchester. Mr. Slagg was one who entered Parliament with high expectations, but early in life his health gave way and he died prematurely, to the loss of India. I then raised the question of the demoralizing effect of the Indian liquor laws, generally described as the "out-still" system. I gave the universal testimony of Indian missionaries and Indian reformers to the rapid spread of intemperance, caused by this system. I showed that the Bengal Liquor Commissioners proved an increase of 135 per cent. in the consumption of strong drink in eight years, and I quoted from a letter I had from a retired civilian, who said :—

> I assure you it went against my conscience the way I had to take tenders for the liquor farm at——. The man who promised to sell the greatest quantity of spirits in the course of the year got the contract for farming the liquor. The Parsee contractor who promised to pay still-head duty on the largest quantity of spirits within the period of his farm—one twelvemonth—got the farm. Naturally, as soon as he did so he wanted to open out more shops in as many fresh villages as he could.

I showed how ruinous the effect was on the coolies in the tea gardens and the indigo plantations, and urged a total change of system. I may add that for two or three years I spread through the Temperance societies much literature on this subject, and at last, with my friend, Mr. Caine, secured a condemnation of the system which had a marked effect in India. Of this more anon.

The house was much quieter this Session—at least for a time—and less obstruction prevailed. The new rules worked well, especially the meeting of the House at three p.m. instead of four p.m., and the rule that no opposed business should be taken after midnight. This for the first time allowed us to count on getting to

bed at something like a regular hour. The chief work of the Session was the Local Government Bill, carried through the House very ably by Mr. Ritchie. This Act was thoroughly successful. It created the London County Council, and was supplemented some years after by the Parish Councils' Act, carried through by Sir Henry Fowler. These great measures have almost changed the face of the country so far as local government is concerned. They have had a most educating effect, and I can say as regards Wales they have largely abated the political and sectarian bitterness which divided the two parties. Looking back upon Wales as I first knew it, and seeing what it is now, after fifteen years of good local government and excellent intermediate education, I can say that mutual respect has taken the place of misunderstanding and dislike. All classes and creeds work together for the common good, and find that they differ much less than they imagined. More or less the same is true of all parts of Great Britain, and one only hopes that it may be true some day of Ireland; but that time has not yet arrived.

I was successful this Session in carrying through the House unanimously a motion "deploring the rapid spread of demoralizing literature, and asking that the law against obscene publications and indecent pictures and prints should be vigorously enforced, and, if necessary, strengthened." I received support on all sides of the House, and one effect was to elicit a condemnation of the translation of the abominable novels of Zola into English, and their publication by Vizetelly. I quoted from the *Edinburgh Review* as to the cheap literature devoured by the street children of London :—

> The feast spread for them is ready and abundant, but every dish is a false one, every condiment vile. Every morsel of food is doctored, every draught of wine is drugged; no true hunger is satisfied, no true thirst quenched; and the hapless guests depart with a depraved appetite, and a palate more than ever dead to every pure taste and every perception of what is good and true. Thus entertained and equipped, the wide army of the children of the poor are sent on their way to take part in the great battle of life, with false views, false impressions and foul aims. The pictures of men and women to whom they have been introduced are unreal and untrue. The whole drama of life as they see it is a lie from beginning to end, and in it they can play none but a vicious and unhappy part.

I added the following observations (reported in the third person) :—

Could any one be surprised at the misery and degradation and immorality that abounded in London when he pictured to himself the intellectual food upon which the children had feasted for so many years? Need they wonder that they were rearing in London a population which, to a large extent, would prove a source of weakness to the nation? He regretted to say that in a great measure the Elementary Education Act had been a failure on account of the total want of safeguards to protect the children after they left school—on account of the innumerable temptations that surrounded them on every side; and amongst these temptations he ranked the sale of licentious literature, with which we were literally surfeited. This literature penetrated everywhere. He was informed there were men employed as agents, going round to the middle class and upper schools of the country, in order to place in the hands of boys and girls pictures of a vile kind, and advertisements of a vile kind, so as to induce them to purchase these demoralizing works. He was told there was a well-organized system of this kind which penetrated into nearly all the schools of the country. He came in contact with many persons who made it the business of their lives to try and rescue the young from these snares. Facts had been brought to his knowledge which had filled him with sadness, facts of so shocking a nature, he could scarcely state them to the House. But one which he believed to be thoroughly authentic he would state; he had it from a lady who had investigated it with care, and who had ascertained the true facts of the case. It had become the rule with a class of low booksellers in London to provide indecent literature for young girls, to offer them every inducement to come into the shops and read the books, to provide them with private rooms stocked with the vilest class of literature, where, on making the small deposit of 6*d*., they were supplied with this literature. And he was told that in many cases these shops were in league with houses of the worst class, to which the girls, when their minds were sufficiently polluted and depraved, were consigned. This had become a trade carried on to such an extent that he was told there was one street in London where ten shops were devoted to this purpose. He asked what the law of this country was doing? What were they doing to allow such abominations to continue?

The Home Secretary, Mr. Matthews (now Lord Llandaff), heartily supported me. So did every member who spoke. One result of the debate was the prosecution of Vizetelly by the Solicitor-General, and his conviction. This caused the withdrawal or destruction of a vast quantity of bad French novels. The *Times* said:—

On October 31 Mr. Henry Vizetelly, the publisher, pleaded guilty before the Recorder, at the Central Criminal Court, of publishing an obscene libel by the sale of an English translation of Zola's novel *La Terre*. He was sentenced to pay a fine of £100 and to enter into his own recognizances in £200 to keep the peace and to be of good behaviour for twelve months. This is a sufficiently heavy punishment when it is considered that Mr. Vizetelly had undertaken, through his counsel, at

once to withdraw from circulation all the translations of Zola's works published by him, so that, in addition to paying a not inconsiderable fine, he will suffer a severe commercial loss. At the same time it is not a vindictive punishment, and, considering the looseness with which the law relating to obscene libels has been administered of late years, it would certainly have been impolitic to inflict any such punishment on a person who pleaded guilty. By pleading guilty Mr. Vizetelly may be held to have virtually admitted that when he published a translation of *La Terre*, he committed an offence for which he was ready to run the risk of being prosecuted.

The question of policy involved in prosecutions of this kind is not very easy to decide, but assuredly most people will agree that the publication of cheap translations of the worst of Zola's novels is a grave offence against public morals, and that it is a good thing that the law should be invoked to restrain it. Between prudery and pruriency in such matters there is a wide debatable ground, and it is not always easy to draw the line which separates what is permissible from what is not. But if the line is not to be drawn so as to exclude translations of such works of Zola as *La Terre* and *Pot Bouilli*, it is plain that it cannot be drawn at all. They are published purely for the sake of gain, and for gain which cannot be realized except by the corruption of those who buy and read them. The evil wrought by literature of this vile character is immense, as was shown and acknowledged in the debate on obscene publications initiated in the House of Commons during the last Session by Mr. Samuel Smith. In any case, we fear, the law can do little to cope with this evil, but it is well that the little that it can do should be done.

In conjunction with Mr. Coote, the indefatigable secretary of the National Vigilance Society, I circulated over 100,000 copies of the debate all over the country, and it had a wonderful effect in stiffening the backs of the magistrates. Large numbers of convictions were obtained, and a great mass of putrid filth was destroyed. I was told that one publisher had to destroy 50,000 volumes. I received threatening letters from some of these scoundrels. For some years a considerable check was given to this abominable trade, but it revived again some years ago, and I had again to bring it before Parliament, of which more anon.

About this time I attended a series of meetings in Grosvenor House on Sunday afternoons to hear addresses by Henry Drummond. The Duke of Westminster gave the use of his splendid suite of rooms for this purpose and was usually present himself, and many of our leading public men appeared on the platform. They were unique gatherings. I never saw so many leading politicians listening to lectures on the Christian faith. Professor Drummond had a most attractive personality. He spoke with

great lucidity. His language was perfect, and a kind of mystic idealism carried you away with him. His book *Natural Law in the Spiritual World* was in great vogue and had an immense circulation. It may be doubted whether his philosophical theories will live, but his fine unselfish character diffused a hallowed influence wherever he went. He certainly reproduced certain aspects of the life of Christ in a way that was new to British Christianity.

I also attended some of the meetings of the Pan-Presbyterian Alliance which met in London that year. We were received one evening by Lord Balfour at Argyll Lodge, to meet many distinguished Americans. Another interesting function that lingers in my memory was Lord Aberdeen's reception at Dollis Hill, in honour of Mr. Gladstone. The aged statesman then frequently spent his week-ends there.

We suffered from extraordinary cold that summer in London. Snow fell in many parts of England about the middle of July. It was six inches deep on the Grampians on July 11 and 12. The mean temperature in London on two days in July was 46° and 48°. The season was very wet and the crops very poor. The latter part of the Session was noted for the passing of the Parnell Commission Act, amid scenes of intense bitterness. Its nugatory result I have already referred to.

An important event in my private history happened that summer. We had been looking for a place in Scotland for some time, and were directed to Orchill, near Crieff, which was then for sale. It was beautifully situated near the Ochills, and I bought it for an autumn residence. One chief inducement was my wife's health, which was not good, and we hoped the bracing air would set her up. I little thought how short a time she would have to enjoy it. While it was getting ready we took Eastwood on the Tay, beside Dunkeld, where we spent August and September amidst the beautiful scenery of that region.

An Autumn Session was convened this year to enable the Government to obtain a second instalment of five millions for the extension of the Ashbourne Land Purchase Act in Ireland. That scheme had worked very well, and I was sorry Mr. Gladstone and the Liberal Party opposed this extension. I could not associate myself with them. I have always supported land purchase in Ireland, believing that the gradual creation of a class of peasant proprietors is, above all, what Ireland needs. I have not seen my way to support the compulsory sale of the whole landlord interest ;

but where it can be brought about by mutual agreement between landlord and tenant, the State should give it every assistance compatible with reasonable security against loss. After angry debates the Government carried the extension of the Ashbourne Act, and long since all the money granted has been used up without loss to the State. As we shall see later on, other and much larger votes of public money have been made for the same purpose; but they were coupled with conditions which have greatly hampered their operation, and but little use has been made of them so far.

CHAPTER XXVIII

Session of 1889—Debate on Evening Continuation Schools—Payment of Members—Drink and Opium in India—Death of John Bright—The Bimetallic Movement—Welsh Intermediate Education Act—The Armenians

AFTER the various Christmas and New Year's engagements at Liverpool were finished—among which I may mention my annual breakfast to the members of the Y.M.C.A., one of the happiest functions I ever shared—I took Mrs. Smith to Cannes for a little change, as her health was not good. We had, as usual, bright sunny weather, but cold and frosty. We came home refreshed and I was ready for the Session of Parliament, which met towards the end of February. I was very successful this year in the ballot, and secured four important debates on questions of great interest. Private members had then much more time and opportunity than now. We usually had both Tuesdays and Fridays for Motions, besides Wednesdays up to Whitsuntide for Bills, and we had other chances on going into Committee of Supply. By the diligent use of the ballot I was able to bring before the House almost every social and moral question in which I was interested, and no Session was more fruitful than this one.

On the first night I spoke on the address upon the need of Evening Continuation Schools, and I was able on March 15 to bring forward a motion on that important subject, which occupied almost the whole sitting. I got support from all sides of the House. I described what I saw in Germany and how in that country, by continuous training of the young, they had practically extirpated the class of ragged and pauper children, whereas it swarmed in all our English towns. I said :—

> We have a large class of parents in England who are little better than savages. They do nothing for their children ; they prey upon them ;

they treat them as wage earners from the earliest years of their life, and under the degrading influences that surround them, these children sink into that state of heathenism in which a considerable part of our people live. There is no way of Christianizing, of civilizing them, except by the State putting them into schools and keeping them there as long as they can be kept. But we allow the children of the poorest class to leave our schools at 11 or 12 years of age, and then they pass through the education of the slums; they sink down into the same state of degradation as that in which their parents live, and in a few years become parents of another crop of the same destitute class, and create another generation of "the unemployed" in our large towns, for this class is always unemployed, and never will be anything else. How should they be anything else? They have never learned a trade; they have no means of living but by what they can pick up in the streets by odd jobs. By the time the children have grown up into youth they are hopelessly condemned to a life of poverty and degradation. We have let go the critical moment for changing their destiny; we have lost the period between 12 and 16, when the character is forming and when education can be turned to good account, and to our shame we have let these evils repeat themselves from generation to generation. Let me quote a few lines from a writer who has spent his life working among this class and knows exactly what he writes:—

"Year by year (says the Rev. Benjamin Waugh) from 70,000 to 80,000 London children pass out of elementary schools; of these, possibly, the half obtain *bona fide* occupation. As for the rest—the poorer part, inhabiting, too, the more densely-populated quarters—there is nothing for them but the streets, and the almost certain life of a knave or a fool. It is probable that, every day, not less than 70,000 boys and girls are actually 'hob-jobbing' about, utterly helpless, until they hob-job into gaols, penitentiaries, and reformatories."

I was seconded by Mr. Hayes Fisher, and heartily supported by Mr. Mundella, George Dixon, of Birmingham, Sir Lyon Playfair, and to a considerable extent by the Vice-President of the Council, Sir Wm. Hart-Dyke. There was indeed practical unanimity, and I felt deeply gratified at this result of many years' labour in the cause of education. It is true that we have not even yet got all that I asked for; but the fact I have already mentioned—that by voluntary means we have now half a million of children in evening schools in place of 30,000—is an enormous gain, and the complete liberty to teach all kinds of practical knowledge instead of the mere verbalism that used to prevail is equally important. Nothing in our country is ever done *per saltum*; it is always piecemeal legislation. It suits the practical character of the nation, and on the whole works well. The Report of the Royal Commission on education wonderfully helped this movement. It practically

killed the barbarous system of "payment by results," and widened and liberalized the whole educational curriculum. I regard Mundella, George Dixon, and Sir John Lubbock (now Lord Avebury) as among the greatest educational reformers in my time. Of course we all allow the first place to W. E. Forster, the author of the great Act of 1870, but he died soon after I entered Parliament.

In the same month I opposed the proposal to pay Members of Parliament. I have always taken the line that where you can obtain the gratuitous services of intelligent and honourable men, as we do in Great Britain, it is a pity to encourage the class of professional politicians. I said:—

To introduce the system of paid Members of Parliament will be to supplant the voluntary by the professional politician. I cannot but remember what I have seen in other countries—the United States in particular—and I believe the introduction of paid Members would sooner or later lower the character of this House. You may depend upon it, that if we have payment of Members of Parliament we shall soon have payment of Members in Town Councils and County Councils, School Boards and Boards of Guardians, the Magistracy, and all those public bodies with which the country is covered. This is, so to speak, the thin end of the wedge. We are discussing now, not merely the payment of a few hunderds of Members of Parliament, but we are discussing the ultimate payment of 10,000 or 20,000, or 30,000 persons holding public offices throughout the country and doing their work both honestly and gratuitously. What have been the consequences in other countries of the adoption of this course? We could not expect this country to escape from the degradation of politics which has taken place in France. And we all know what exists in the United States of America. It is urged that the adoption of payment of Members will bring a large number of working men's representatives into Parliament. I do not believe it. Where the system does exist we do not find that working men are elected. So far as I am aware, not a single working man sits at Washington at the present moment—at least, I have never heard of any; nor have I ever heard of any in France. ["Oh!"] It may be that there are, but I have never heard of any.[1]

I then quoted Mr. Bryce's standard work on the American Commonwealth:—

"Politics has now become a gainful profession, like advocacy, stock-broking, the dry goods trade, or the getting up of companies. People go into it to live by it, primarily for the sake of the salaries attached to the places they count on getting. Secondarily, in view of the opportunities it affords of making incidental and sometimes illegitimate gains. Every person in a high administrative post, whether Federal,

[1] I believe since then a few *ouvriers* have been returned to the French Chamber.

State, or Municipal, and, above all, every member of Congress, has opportunities of rendering services to wealthy individuals and companies for which they are willing to pay secretly in money or in money's worth. The better officials and legislators—they are the great majority, except in large cities—resist the temptation. The worst succumb to it, and the prospect of these illicit profits renders a political career distinctly more attractive to an unscrupulous man."

I went on to say :—

Now, as we are aware that in America the system of paid professional politicians has led to these abuses, I say that, in the course of time, when full opportunity has been given to work out the system in this country, we shall see similar effects here. Parliament is now free from corruption ; but, with paid Members, we should, 20, or 30, or 50 years hence, when the present Leaders of Party had been taken away, see a very different state of things. In Washington's time the American Republic began on virgin soil, and it had statesmen of the highest character at the head of affairs. It took 50 years of the professional politician system entirely to change all that. I say that after we have had a generation of paid Members, under the same conditions as in America, there is too much reason to believe the same fruits will be produced in this country. Just conceive what it will be to put into the hands of a body of professional politicians, largely living by politics, the control of £120,000,000 (now nearly £200,000,000) of local and imperial taxation ! Consider what would be the consequences of entrusting to Committees drawn from this class Private Bill legislation involving enormous sums. Take as an illustration the Manchester Ship Canal. There was an enterprise dealing with £8,000,000 of money ; it was promoted as determinedly on the one side as it was opposed on the other, and each side spent some £100,000 or more in Parliamentary expenses. The decision was left to a small Committee of five Members ; and we have never had a suggestion or a whisper as to the honesty or uprightness of those members. But go to the United States, and you will find in respect of such undertakings that each side provides a large amount for " blackmailing," and if it wishes to carry a Bill it will have to disburse heavily from this Secret Service fund. This Secret Service fund is disbursed to a large extent among members of the Committees. It is a notorious fact that it is almost impossible for any great corporation in America to carry through its work without putting aside a large amount of money for " lobbying," and for secret and unavowed purposes. There is a class called " lobbyists " in America, whose profession it is to get through bills. They receive large sums of money of which they give no public account, for it is perfectly well understood that they could not be publicly vouched for. I see from the accounts of one railway quoted in this book (Mr. Bryce's) that it had put aside no less than 4,800,000 dollars for this Secret Service fund, or nearly a million sterling, in the last few years. Will the House permit me to read a short extract from my hon. friend's book on this system of lobbying ? It is well that we should know something about this system, which may

some day migrate to this country ; and from what I saw during the time I resided in America, I can vouch for the truth of every word of what I am about to read :—

" The doors of Congress are besieged by a whole army of commercial or railroad men and their agents, to whom, since they have come to form a sort of profession, the name of ' Lobbyists ' is given. Many Congress men are personally interested, and ' lobby ' for themselves among their colleagues from the vantage ground of their official positions. That the capital and the hotels at Washington are a nest of such intrigues and machinations while Congress is sitting, is admitted on all hands ; but how many of the members are tainted no one can tell."

How long, I ask, could you keep such a system out of England if you once admitted the professional class of politicians ? I hold that it is true patriotism to face these facts, and take due cognizance of them, rather than rush into a change of which many are unable to estimate the ultimate consequences, and not improbably the majority of those who now promote it will, in the end, deeply regret their share in its introduction. Under our present political system, although there is far too much of party bitterness, there are few countries in the world in which politicians are so free from the charge of Parliamentary corruption, or where such a thing as the acceptance of a bribe by a member of the legislature, is so absolutely unknown.

I am quite aware that there are two sides to this question. We have no more upright men in the House than some of the " labour members," and they feel it rather trying to be paid by their own constituents or by the trade unions. They feel that they would be more independent if paid by the State. No doubt a moderate salary, say £300 to £500 a year, would admit to Parliament some men of talent who are now excluded. It is also true that syndicates of capitalists are a danger to all commercial countries, and we do not want our legislatures to be dominated by rich men. But as a matter of fact it is found that under the " paid-member " system it is easier for wealthy " trusts " like those in America to control State and national legislatures. So many of the members are poor men, and are open to pecuniary influence. In our Parliament, with all its faults, it is impossible to use corrupt influence to any serious extent. The mass of members have independent means, and cannot be bought or bribed. It is, like all political questions, a case of a balance of advantages, and I think the weight of argument is in favour of our voluntary and gratuitous system which is the admiration of the world.

I was singularly fortunate in securing two first places in one week after Easter, and introduced on Tuesday a motion condemning the system pursued by the Indian Government in regard to the

drink trade. I was seconded by my friend, Mr. Caine, who had just returned from a cold weather trip to India, and who was deeply impressed by the evils of the "out-still" system. We were opposed by Sir John Gorst and Sir Richard Temple on the part of the Government, but great sympathy was felt for our cause on both sides of the House, and we succeeded in carrying our motion by a majority of ten, in spite of the strongest efforts of the Government whips! This was only the second time the Government had been defeated since it took office. It was a great encouragement to the Temperance Party throughout the country, and it led to great improvements in the excise system of India. As many as 10,000 licences were taken away in the one province of Madras, and the "out-still" system was practically killed. I have already referred pretty fully to this subject in the previous Session, so need not say more than that the question must not be allowed to sleep. The dire necessity to raise revenue from so poor a country is a constant temptation to push the consumption of dutiable articles, and I see no real security except some form of popular control. Both the Hindoo and Mohammedan religions condemn the use of strong drink, and the people should be allowed to prohibit its sale if they please, as used to be done by their native rulers in their best days.

On the Friday of that week I again secured the first place for a motion condemning the opium trade between India and China, and urging its discontinuance. I have been most of my life a supporter of the anti-opium society, and have repeatedly spoken in and out of Parliament on the subject. This was the best opportunity I enjoyed to put the whole case fully before the House. I will venture to quote some extracts from my speech, chiefly citations from the very best authorities on the subject. They put the case in a nutshell, so far as its moral bearings are concerned :—

As far as I can gather from the early history of China, there was no common use of opium there, in the sense in which it now exists, until towards the close of the 18th century. There is no allusion to it in the literature of the country as a national vice, in the sense in which it is spoken of to-day. Indeed, there is no evidence that opium smoking was a common practice in China until towards the end of the 18th century and the beginning of the 19th. Up to the year 1767 the export of opium from India to China seldom exceeded 200 chests a year; in 1767 that amount was increased and it grew during that century to about 4,000 chests, while now it has gone up to the terrible figure of 100,000 chests a year. As soon as the habit began to spread the Chinese

Government passed stringent regulations against the use, manufacture, and sale of opium in their dominions. These regulations became more and more severe until at last the Chinese Government went so far as to decree capital punishment against those who either smoked or sold opium. When the trade was forbidden it was carried on between India and China by smugglers, the opium being sold by the East India Company to the smugglers for the avowed purpose of being run into China, the profit derived from the trade being divided between the Company and the smugglers. To show what the East India Company thought of the effects of this drug I will quote a few lines from a Despatch dated 1817, in which they say—

"Were it possible to prevent the use of the drug altogether we would gladly do it in compassion to mankind."

But, notwithstanding this fine sentiment, the East India Company were not ashamed to make a profit out of the degradation of the Chinese. The trade thus went on until in 1836 the Chinese Government made a determined effort to stop it, and resolved once for all to stamp it out. The result of that action on their part was the first Chinese war. The act which immediately led to that war was the destruction of 20,000 chests of opium, which were seized by the Chinese authorities at Canton and thrown into the river, in doing which the Chinese Government were acting entirely within their own rights. What would any European country have done under similar circumstances? We had no right to go to war on such a ground, but unhappily we did go to war and bombarded Canton and many other defenceless towns, and in the end compelled the Chinese to pay to the smuggling traders an indemnity for the opium destroyed. Still, we could not get them to legalize the trade. Our Ambassador, Sir H. Pottinger, tried it, and what was the noble reply made to him by the Chinese Emperor? He said :—

"It is true I cannot prevent the introduction of the flowing poison: : : Gain-seeking and corrupt men will, for profit and sensuality, defeat my wishes, but nothing will induce me to derive a revenue from the vice and misery of my people."

Then a letter was written by the Chinese Government to Sir H. Pottinger, in which they said :—

"Our nations have been united by a friendly commercial intercourse for 200 years. How then, at this time, are our old relations so suddenly changed, so as to be the cause of national quarrel? It arises most assuredly from the spreading opium poison. Opium is neither pulse nor grain, and yet multitudes of our Chinese subjects consume it, wasting their property and destroying their lives, and the calamities arising therefrom are unutterable. How is it possible for us to refrain from forbidding our people to use it?"

That was what a heathen Government wrote to Christian England. And now I will read a few words from one whose authority, I am sure, will be recognized by this House. I refer to the right hon. gentleman, the Member for Mid-Lothian (Mr. Gladstone). Speaking in the year 1840, about the Chinese War, the right hon. gentleman said :—

"They gave you notice to abandon your contraband trade. When they found that you would not, they had a right to drive you from their coasts, on account of your obstinacy in persisting in this infamous and atrocious traffic. You allowed your agent to aid and abet those who were concerned in carrying on that trade; and I do not know how it can be urged as a crime against the Chinese that they refused provisions to those who refused obedience to their laws whilst residing within their territories. A war more unjust in its origin, a war more calculated to cover this country with permanent disgrace, I do not know, and I have not read of. The right hon. gentleman opposite spoke of the British flag waving in glory at Canton. That flag is hoisted to protect an infamous contraband traffic; and if it never were hoisted, except as it is now hoisted on the coast of China, we should recoil from its sight with horror."

The right hon. gentleman has spoken many noble words, but he certainly never spoke any that were nobler or truer than these. Nevertheless, the smuggling of opium into China still went on until, in 1858, it had the effect of producing the second Chinese war, which sprang out of the case of the lorcha *Arrow*, which was seized by the Chinese. This was during the Government of Lord Palmerston. In this war the Chinese were again defeated, the capital of China was taken, and the Chinese compelled at the point of the bayonet to legalize the trade in opium under the Treaty of Tientsin. Therefore, it was not till we had fought two successful wars that we were enabled to bring about that result. The trade then went on; but what the Chinese thought about the matter may be gathered from what was said by Sir Thomas Wade, our Ambassador at Pekin, who wrote the following despatch to the British Government in 1868:—

"We are generally prone to forget that the footing we have in China has been obtained by force, and by force alone, and that, unwarlike and unenergetic as we hold the Chinese to be, it is in reality to the fear of force alone that we are indebted for the safety we enjoy at certain points accessible to our force. . . . Yet nothing that has been gained, it must be remembered, was received from the free-will of the Chinese; more, the concessions made to us from time to time have been, from first to last, extorted against the conscience of the nation; in defiance, that is to say, of the moral convictions of its educated men; not merely of the office-holders, whom we call mandarins, and who are numerically but a small proportion of the educated class, but of the millions who are saturated with a knowledge of the history and philosophy of their country. To these, as a rule, the very extension of our trade must appear politically, or what is in China the same thing, morally wrong; and the story of foreign intercourse during the last thirty years can have had no effect but to confirm them in their opinion."

These were the deliberate words of our own Ambassador at Pekin—the one who extorted the Treaty of Tientsin. There is one more quotation on this point of the subject which I should like to read. I do not know anything more touching, and I am sure there is not one here but will feel the force of it. Here is our Ambassador's despatch

of 1869, in which he reports that the Chinese Minister used the following notable words in reply to the charge that the Chinese Government were hostile to foreigners. The Chinese Ministers at first disputed the fact, but—

"In the end Wen-Seang shifted his ground and asked how could it be otherwise? They had often seen foreigners making war on the country; and then, again, how irreparable and continuous was the injury which they saw inflicted upon the whole Empire by the foreign importation of opium! If England would consent to interdict this—cease either to grow it in India, or to allow their ships to bring it to China—there might be some hope of more friendly feelings. No doubt there was a very strong feeling entertained by all the literati and gentry as to the frightful evils attending the smoking of opium, its thoroughly demoralizing effects, and the utter ruin brought upon all who once gave way to the vice. They believed the extension of this pernicious habit was mainly due to the alacrity with which foreigners supplied the poison for their own profit, perfectly regardless of the irreparable injury inflicted, and naturally they felt hostile to all concerned in such a traffic. . . If England ceased to protect the trade it could then be effectually prohibited by the Emperor; and it would eventually cease to trouble them, while a great cause of hostility and distrust in the minds of the people would be removed.

I further quoted the evidence given by our two Ambassadors to China before a Parliamentary Committee in 1871. Sir Rutherford Alcock answered the following question:—

Can the evils, physical, moral, commercial, and political, as respects individuals, families, and the nation at large, of indulgence in this vice be exaggerated?—I have no doubt that, where there is a great amount of evil, there is always a certain danger of exaggeration; but looking to the universality of the belief among the Chinese, that whenever a man takes to smoking opium it will probably be the impoverishment and ruin of his family—a popular feeling which is universal both among those who are addicted to it, who always consider themselves as moral criminals and amongst those who abstain from it, and are merely endeavouring to prevent its consumption—it is difficult not to conclude that what we hear of it is essentially true, and that it is a source of impoverishment and ruin to families.

Sir Thomas Wade said:—

It is to me vain to think otherwise of the drug in China than as a habit many times more pernicious, nationally speaking, than the gin and whisky drinking which we deplore at home. It takes possession more insidiously, and keeps its hold to the full as tenaciously. It has insured, in every case within my knowledge, the steady descent, moral and physical, of the smoker; and it is so far a greater mischief than drink, that it does not, by external evidence of its effect, expose its

victim to the loss of repute which is the penalty of habitual drunkenness.

I will only add one more quotation from my speech :—

Japan, one of the most progressive countries in that part of the world, has stipulated with every Power that no opium shall be imported into her ports, and she imposes very heavy penalties on its sale ; and the consequence is that Japan is rapidly rising in the scale, while China is declining. This is largely owing to the fact that one nation prohibits while the other allows the trade. I believe that if this nation had the honesty and moral courage to adopt the policy I recommend, compensation would come to us from unexpected quarters. We should gain enormously in our trade with China, which is at present stagnant compared with 20 years ago. With India our trade is increasing by leaps and bounds ; with China it has been falling off for the last ten or fifteen years. Let me quote a few figures in proof of this. I will take the returns of the exports from the United Kingdom to India. In 1871 the exports were valued at £20,900,000 : in 1887 they had risen to £33,600,000. But whereas the exports to China in 1881 were £9,400,000, in 1887 they had fallen to £8,700,000. We have virtually free trade with China ; we have access to all the great waterways and all the great cities, and yet our trade is falling off. China has 350,000,000 people, and India 250,000,000 ; yet while India spends 2*s*. 8*d*. per head with us, China only spends 6*d*. per head. The fact is, the opium traffic has killed legitimate trade in China ; and who can doubt but that the Chinese would spend much more on Manchester goods and on all our other products if they did not spend such large sums on Indian opium ?

And I concluded with the words :—

The reform I now ask for cannot be carried except by some self-denial, but nothing ennobles a nation more than to make sacrifices for a great cause. God has blessed this nation in many ways ; and if we refuse to purge away this national sin, retribution will overtake us and the evil thing will be wrested from us in tears and in blood. I appeal to the house to-night to show by their action that they believe in a righteous Ruler of the universe.

Sir Joseph Pease seconded my motion, but it was lost by a large majority. However, the verdict was reversed in a subsequent Session by a vote which condemned our opium policy, but its effect was rendered nugatory by the appointment of a Commission which practically whitewashed the trade, and nothing has been done since then to clear the nation of this stain on its escutcheon. Our great difficulty now is that China grows so much native opium that the stoppage of the Indian supply would hardly make any difference, and it is argued that we would now deprive poor India

of a revenue, which amounts to some £3,000,000 a year, without any benefit to China. The Chinese Government has also now become an accomplice in the hateful trade, as it levies an import duty, though less than the Indian Government obtains. It is clear that we cannot expect India to forfeit a source of revenue merely to relieve our national conscience. The only honest course is to act as we did at the time of negro emancipation; that is, to pay the cost ourselves. I much fear that in this age of relaxed public morality and excessive expenditure on war and armaments, it will be very difficult to lift the nation to this height of self-denial.

In the spring of this year that great Tribune of the people, John Bright, passed away amid the universal sorrow of the nation. No public man ever secured more love and admiration in the later years of his life, though constantly in opposition to the selfish and often popular impulses of the nation, and generally in a minority and often vehemently attacked; yet no one ever voiced more fully the highest conscience of the nation, or enjoyed at the close of his life more general esteem. The memorial speeches in the House of Commons were worthy of the occasion, and Gladstone, as usual, led the way by a splendid eulogium on his old colleague, who had separated from him on the question of Home Rule.

The Report of the Parnell Commission, which brought to light the Pigott forgeries and absolved Parnell from the horrible charges brought against him, was fiercely debated in Parliament with scenes of great violence. The country was deeply moved, and a strong reaction set in in favour of Mr. Gladstone's policy, as seen by the course of the bye elections.

The bimetallic movement was at this time at the height of its popularity, and seemed almost to be carrying the day. A great deputation approached Lord Salisbury on May 30. We were received in the Foreign Office, which was crowded. Sixty members of Parliament were present, and a large number of Peers, and several hundred delegates from all parts of Great Britain. Mr. Chaplin introduced the deputation, and I seconded, and Mr. Goschen gave a friendly reply. We raised the subject in the House of Commons a few days afterwards, and again Mr. Chaplin led off, and I seconded, and we had a very interesting debate. Everything then turned on the possibility of establishing an international agreement and a common ratio between gold and silver. The Gold and Silver Commission reported almost unanimously that this ratio would hold good if the leading commercial nations adopted it.

But insuperable difficulties arose on the question of ratio. France declined to alter her 15½ to 1; the United States held to her old rate of 16 to 1; and those nations who had demonetized silver and adopted the gold standard declined to remonetize silver at an artificial price, far above its then market value. My own leaning was for a ratio of 20 to 1; but so much time was lost in fruitless negotiations that silver fell far below that level. Besides, great discoveries of gold were made, as I have already pointed out, and this relieved the strain on that metal. The gold product of the world rose from twenty millions a year in 1873 to fifty or sixty at the close of the century, and the long decline of prices was thereby stopped. All this was only beginning to be discoverable in 1889, but a few years later it became obvious to all that the crisis had passed, and that it was not worth while to upset our monetary system. This was the conclusion at which many of us arrived when the gold standard was introduced into India, and the rupee was rated to it at 1*s.* 4*d.*, or the ratio of about 22 to 1.

I paid a very interesting visit to Halifax about the middle of June, to attend a conference of Yorkshire educationists. I stayed with Edward Crossley, M.P., and met his venerable father-in-law, Sir Edward Baines, founder and owner of the *Leeds Mercury*, then in his ninetieth year. He was truly a wonderful old man, and was still able to speak with clearness and force. I had several opportunities of advocating the system of evening Continuation schools, based upon technical and industrial training. On returning to London I had that discussion with Henry George at the National Liberal Club, to which I have already referred (page 151), and then had the great joy of seeing the bill for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children carried through Parliament. Some of the provisions I advocated at Liverpool, many years before, then became law. Indeed, the seed sown in Liverpool when the first society in the kingdom was established led by necessary consequence to the London and other great societies, and the discovery of the weak points in the law. It may be said that this Act was the poor children's charter. It was ably conducted by Sir Richard Webster (now Lord Alverstone), who has always been a true friend of philanthropic causes.

We also carried through the House the first draft of the Welsh Intermediate Education Bill, which has wrought a revolution in Wales. Its secondary schools were few and far between in those days, and very destitute of modern appliances. Now it has an admirable system of first-class intermediate schools filling up the

blank between the elementary schools and the university. These schools, some ninety in number, with 8,000 scholars, give a first-rate scientific as well as literary education. They have evoked national enthusiasm, and drawn out liberality to a surprising extent. They have placed Welsh education far above that of England, and possibly even above that of Scotland. They are rearing a class of citizens who will play a distinguished part in the life of the nation, and my best wish for England is that it may adopt a system equally popular and democratic, and as well suited to the demands of modern life.

Before leaving London to go to Orchill, our new place in Perthshire, about the middle of August, I addressed the House on the subject of the sufferings of the Armenian people. The terrible massacres had not then commenced, but oppression and terrorism were rampant, and some of us felt that unless pressure were applied at Constantinople worse things would follow. No one, however, anticipated the awful catastrophe that was soon to occur.

CHAPTER XXIX

Orchill—Visit to Ireland—The Home Rule Question and Federal Government for the Empire

THIS autumn (1889) we entered into possession of our Perthshire residence, and happy memories cluster round that temple of peace. They are of too private a nature to put into the records of public life, but one may go so far as to say that no happier home could well be imagined than this picturesque mansion with its ornamental lake and the background of mountains, on which the sun glinted all day long: where cloud and sky effects were ever changing, and where the exquisite foliage of early summer was followed by the rich autumn tints of September and October. The contrast between the torrid streets of London and the stifling air of Westminster, and the cool mountain breezes of Perthshire was delicious. Many a time I came there from a temperature of 80° to 85°, and found it 10° or 15° lower, and as bracing as London was enervating. I began about this time to suffer greatly from nervous indigestion, the result of over-fatigue. Often when I arrived at Orchill I was quite exhausted, but a few weeks of its strong cool air made me another man. The family life was then unbroken, and a large circle of visitors made our sweet home the perfection of domestic happiness. I little foresaw what sad changes were near at hand. It is well the future is hidden from us, for we could hardly endure the present if we knew how hollow the ground was beneath our feet.

I have seldom enjoyed an autumn holiday more than this year. I started off, much refreshed, for a tour in Ireland with my friend, Thomas Dickson, M.P., with the intention of probing, as far as I could, the causes of unrest in that unhappy island. On the way I went to a great Welsh gathering at Carnarvon, in the pavilion erected for the Eisteddfod, where 10,000 people assembled to hear Sir Wm. Harcourt. He was in those days at the zenith of his fame, and was, with John Morley, a chief pillar of Mr. Gladstone's

ORCHILL

policy: Few men could rouse a huge meeting better than Harcourt. His burly figure, his never-failing quips and *bon mots* kept the audience in high humour from first to last. We had the Welsh Liberal Party at that time entirely in the Gladstonian fold. Indeed, Wales has never succumbed to a Tory reaction, but remains to this day Liberal to the core.

I spent a most interesting time in Ireland. Mr. Dickson was one of the few Presbyterians who threw himself heartily into the Home Rule cause. He had moved from Ulster to Dublin, and at his hospitable house I saw some of the Nationalist leaders. Among others, I had a long interview with Archbishop Walsh. I was surprised to find so much less aversion to Home Rule among the Protestants of Dublin than among those of Ulster. I paid visits to the best schools of Dublin, especially the Central Model Schools of Marlborough Street—one of the few unsectarian institutions in Ireland, and was delighted with the vast industrial school at Artane carried on by the Christian Brothers. But my main purpose was to study the land question, which was then in an acute stage. I went with Mr. Dickson to Tipperary, and attended a great convention of tenant farmers at Thurles. I shared in the hospitality of that great national leader, Archbishop Croke. I saw Dr. Tanner, who had just come out of gaol, walking arm-in-arm with his Reverence in a triumphal procession, and I met Mr. Sexton, the most brilliant of all the Irish orators, and several of the Nationalist leaders. I afterwards visited the "evicted estate" of Lugnacurran, and went on to Maryborough to witness the trials of the men accused of the murder of Inspector Martin, at Gweedore, and witnessed the whole system of "jury packing." It may interest my readers if I give some extracts from papers I wrote at the time, which were published in several of the English newspapers. The problems are the same as confront us to-day. The agrarian difficulty is unchanged. The Government, as I write, is about to introduce another Land Bill. I wrote these impressions under the powerful influence of Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule policy. I could not now speak so hopefully of its success; but the elements of the problem are the same, and it cannot be amiss to give an honest report of the impressions I got at first hand from the very centre of the disturbed districts:—

In contrasting the Ireland of to-day with that of earlier recollections, I am struck with the subsidence of bitterness between Catholics and Protestants, and especially between the Irish and the English. No

one can mix with the Catholic population without seeing what a beneficial change has passed over their feelings towards England. As a well-known priest said to me, "All bitterness has gone out of their hearts." The change is almost miraculous when we remember the fierce hatred of England that used to rule in the Roman Catholic part of Ireland, and among the Irish people abroad. No one can doubt that this change is the result of Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule policy, and his generous recognition of Irish wrongs. It is the reply of Ireland to the changed attitude of the Liberal party of Great Britain, and to the innumerable friendly ties that have been formed between the leaders and politicians on both sides of St. George's Channel during the last few years. It is the result of increased social intercourse and mutual understanding, and the gradual dispersion of those mists of ignorance and prejudice which kept the two peoples so long apart. As a consequence of this friendlier feeling all talk of separating from England has disappeared. At various meetings of the Nationalist party, and in their most unrestricted intercourse, I never heard a suggestion of it. I believe it has practically vanished from the Irish mind. There have also disappeared to a wonderful degree the conspiracies and secret societies that used to infest Ireland. Whatever else the National League and Land League have done, they have brought into the light of day the Irish grievances, and have entirely killed the secret societies. The greater part of Ireland is as quiet as England and Scotland, and there is even less crime and danger to life and property. There are, of course, some disturbed districts in Clare and Kerry of which so much cannot be said, but wherever I went I found the country perfectly peaceful and orderly.

Another feature that struck me was the gradual acquiescence of many of the Protestants in the three southern provinces in the prospect of Home Rule. I attended a considerable Home Rule meeting of Protestants in Dublin, and I met, besides, several persons who, though not openly Home Rulers, were not averse to the change. I believe that, barring Belfast, where a strong Orange element prevails, there is a silent change going on among the Irish Protestants ; they are coming to have confidence in their Catholic fellow countrymen ; mutual animosity is giving way ; a spirit of fairness is replacing intolerance ; and there is little apprehension of danger to either property or religion.

I wish now to say a word or two about special questions in Ireland. First, the Government prosecutions. I spent two days in the Courthouse at Maryborough, watching the trials of the Gweedore prisoners charged with the murder of Inspector Martin. People on this side can hardly comprehend the way in which Irish opinion was stirred by these trials. They gathered up, so to speak, in one focus the whole system of governing Ireland, the acutest phase of the agrarian question, and the deepest susceptibilities of the Catholic population. I need not repeat, what every one knows, that this miserable affair sprang from the arrest of Father M'Fadden, the much-loved parish priest of Gweedore, on the Sunday after performance of mass to a congregation of one thousand people, and as he was walking to his house in his

canonical robes, followed by crowds of his people. To those who know the veneration in which the poor Catholics hold their priests, and to those who know that the starving population of Gweedore had almost been supported for years by the exertions of Father M'Fadden, it will appear the height of madness to send four or five policemen to arrest him at such a moment. But Inspector Martin, who appears to have been destitute of commonsense, added to the fury of the people by drawing his sword and holding it in a threatening manner above the head of the priest, and a wild cry arose that he was going to kill Father M'Fadden. The people rushed upon the Inspector, struck him with sticks and stones, and killed him almost in a moment, and that in spite of the strongest remonstrance of Father M'Fadden, who did everything he could to restrain the people. I heard the evidence of several policemen, who all bore witness to the earnest efforts of Father M'Fadden to keep the peace. Yet, in spite of this, the Crown prosecutor charged him, as well as many of the Gweedore people, with wilful murder, and the venue of the trial was changed to Queen's County, some two hundred miles from Donegal. Not much fault could be found with the change of venue; but here comes the crux of the situation. The special jury panel of Queen's County contains some 230 jurors, partly Protestant and partly Catholic, all of whom were summoned. These were the leading men of the county, all of over £100 a year valuation; and, as I can testify from observation, a superior class of men. When the first jury was empanelled objection was taken by the Attorney-General to every Catholic whose name was called out, and at last a list of twelve Protestants was secured, who tried the first prisoner, named Coll, who was brought in guilty of manslaughter, and sentenced to ten years' penal servitude. I was present when the second jury was empanelled, and saw every Catholic except one told to "stand by," and that one was a landlord and anti-Nationalist. The deepest indignation was felt both by the Catholic jurors and the Catholic population of Ireland—i.e., three-fourths of the whole—at the slight put upon them. Fancy how the British people would feel if a Protestant prisoner was tried in Liverpool or Manchester or Glasgow by a Catholic jury in a time of intense political excitement. A system of government like this stands self condemned; it is utterly impossible in a democratic age like this, when every one reads the newspaper, to maintain such a farce of justice.

THE LAND QUESTION.

I said that those trials touched the heart of the land question. I could not visit Gweedore or the coast of Donegal, but from personal friends who have been there I gained almost as accurate an account as though I had been there myself. An extremely poor population of six thousand people scrape a bare subsistence from little patches of potatoes, scattered among rocks and bogs; nine hundred holdings pay an aggregate rental of about £1,200 a year, or 25s. to 30s. apiece; and all this turmoil is about a few hundred pounds a year more or less payable to the landlord by all those holdings. I am not able to enter

upon the legal rights or wrongs of the question, but will say this: that in those congested districts there is virtually no rent obtainable from the soil, and the little that is paid is earned by labour in England, or remittances from friends in America. These wretched peasants have in many cases been unable to enter the Land Court either from inability to bear the initial expense, or from arrears hanging over them. But even if they could, the relief granted would be only a few shillings per head. Many of these unhappy creatures are being evicted for non-payment of rent, and their poor hovels destroyed in a way that excites the deepest commiseration in Ireland. No one can doubt that such scenes shake the foundation of social order, and even the just rights of property. Yet we must not always blame the landlord too much, for he is often a poor man, burdened with debt and obligations which he can hardly meet, and is forced by dire necessity to put pressure on his poorer tenants. Some special mode of dealing with those congested districts is absolutely necessary, in which the landlord's rights should be purchased out—and they are not worth much—or in which the peasant should be made secure from eviction, even if the State loses some money in the process.

The Gweedore evictions naturally suggest the troubles of the "Ponsonby Estates" in the south of Ireland, which are stirring public opinion as much as those in Donegal. I could not visit those estates, but I attended the great meeting at Thurles to establish the Tenants' Defence League, and met there Canon Keller, who has acted the same part to the evicted Ponsonby tenants as Father M'Fadden has done to Gweedore. The meeting was most interesting to any one studying the land question in Ireland. There were present about eight hundred representatives of the Tipperary tenant farmers, the most sturdy and determined men in the south of Ireland, largely descended from the Cromwellian Ironsides who were settled in Tipperary, intermarried with the native population, became merged in them, adopted their religion, and have produced a race *Hibernis ipsis Hiberniores*. The speeches, though stirring, were not unreasonable, and contained nothing seditious, and the proceedings were as orderly as at any public meeting in England or Scotland.

This movement sprang out of the interference of Mr. Smith-Barry, a large landlord in Tipperary, with the Ponsonby estates. A quarrel had been raging for three years between the owner and the tenants on those estates; but, at last, through the intervention of Canon Keller, a fair-minded and honourable man, a settlement had almost been reached, and negotiations were proceeding for the sale of the property under Lord Ashbourne's Act. In an evil hour Mr. Smith-Barry got up an English syndicate to buy the Ponsonby estates and prevent this settlement with the tenants—I suppose in order to break up the combination called the "Plan of Campaign." The result has been to aggravate immensely agrarian difficulties in the south of Ireland. His own tenants, in order to protect those on the Ponsonby estate, refused to pay their rents to him unless he withdrew from the syndicate, and he has in consequence evicted some of them, and I was informed

by Canon Keller that no less than two hundred families were evicted on the Ponsonby estates, and two hundred more were under sentence of eviction. The Tenants' Defence Fund is raised to support these families, and to meet landlords' combination by tenants' combination in Ireland.

These cases may be taken as specimens of the agrarian trouble that is keeping Ireland in constant unrest, and the question is naturally asked, Why do not the tenants resort to the Land Courts, and avail themselves of the excellent and generous legislation passed from 1881 to 1887 for their benefit? Till I went to Ireland I myself was perplexed by the failure of that legislation to settle these disputes; but when you get the full explanation on the spot the case appears very different. Many tenants, through poverty or arrears hanging over them, cannot enter the Land Court. On many estates there are some who can, and others who cannot, avail themselves of the Act, and often those who can throw in their lot with those who cannot, in order to strengthen their hands in a desperate contest. Public opinion also insists on all sharing alike what they regard as the sacred duty of self protection, and they who decline doing so have a bad time of it. It is extremely difficult to judge fairly of these questions from an English standpoint. Proceedings like the "Plan of Campaign" appear utterly illegal to any one trained in a commercial country, where security of contract is the foundation of national prosperity, but in Ireland the case is wholly different. For ages the law has been the friend of the strong and the enemy of the weak, till it has become a second nature for the Irish peasant to protect himself by extra-legal methods. For ages the tillers of the soil were ground to death by excessive rents extorted out of their own improvements, and they had no legal protection till the Act of 1881.

The Acts of 1881–87 have really given substantial security to large classes of tenants in Ireland, especially when they are fairly well off and can get legal aid to fight their battles in the Land Courts; but there still remain groups of poor tenants, especially in the congested districts, who for one reason or another have failed to benefit by them, and the agrarian strife is principally confined to those districts. Let me say, in passing, that while some landlords have acted shamefully, and have done their utmost to hinder their tenants from entering the Land Courts, others have acted with true generosity, and get on perfectly well with their tenants. Canon Keller told me of one adjacent to the Ponsonby estates, who had voluntarily lowered his rents 50 per cent., and was most popular with his tenants. I must say that from what I saw and heard I consider the land of Ireland rented higher than similar quality in England and Scotland, especially where the land is poor, and on the slopes of hills. When you add to this that the most of this poor land has been reclaimed by the labour of generations of tenants, and that the houses and farm buildings have usually been built by them, you can understand that the property of the landlords, even when recognized by law, does not possess the same sanctity in their eyes that it does in ours. The position of the landlord is fre-

quently this: that he possesses legal, but scarcely moral, rights, while the tenant has moral but not legal rights, and a conflict is easily provoked unless extreme care is taken to avoid it. Yet it must also be remembered that the present race of landlords is not wholly or indeed chiefly to blame. They inherited a state of things created centuries ago, when cruel and ruthless confiscation took place. They have inherited estates often heavily burdened; they have had to submit to large reductions of rent, though probably not more than in Great Britain, and this has often swept away the free margin of their income, so that they are nothing but rent collectors for the mortgagees or other legal claimants behind them. Some of the largest of these claimants are British capitalists and insurance companies. It is inevitable that some of the landlords in this desperate position should clutch at all the income they are legally entitled to. The tenants often do not understand this, and make scant allowance for it; on the other hand, the landlords often make scant allowance for the extreme poverty of the peasants, and the utter despair which eviction causes them. It is a situation from which no escape seems possible, except through State action of some kind.

The "Lugnacurran case" in East Meath is a dispute of a different class. The tenants are mostly well-to-do and some of the land is good. Two of the tenants paid large rents; one, Mr. Dunn, paid £1,100, and Mr. Kilbride £760 per annum. In addition to them a considerable number paid £20 to £40 per annum. The property belongs to Lord Lansdowne, now Governor-General of India, and I spent a long day in visiting it, and saw much of the evicted tenants, and heard their version of the case. Many of these tenants had judicial rents fixed from 1881–84 before the heavy fall of prices that took place in 1885–86, but the largest tenants, being leaseholders, were excluded from the Act. The pressure of the hard times in 1886 made the tenants claim further reductions, and when they did not get them they joined the "Plan of Campaign," and refused to pay their rents unless they got a further 20 per cent. reduction on the judicial rents (afterwards lowered to 15 per cent.), and, I think, 35 per cent. on the non-judicial rents. I am writing from memory, and may not be accurate, but these are substantially the facts of the case. Lord Lansdowne's agent declined to accede to these demands, and the tenants were evicted in 1887, just before the Land Act of that year was passed; and I was assured that had that Act been passed a few months earlier it would have saved all this trouble, for it allowed the judicial rents to be revised and for the first time included the leaseholders. The revision of the judicial rents would have given a reduction of 13 per cent. and the non-judicial (the leaseholder) 30 to 35 per cent. Unfortunately the blood of both parties had got up, and no settlement has been arrived at, though the tenants told me they had offered to leave the case to arbitration. For two years the estate has been farmed by the "Irish Land Corporation," a body started by the landlords to manage evicted estates. There appears to be no cropping, and nothing doing as far as I could see except letting cattle graze over it. Much of the land is covered with

weeds and is going back to a state of nature, and the houses, when not occupied by "Emergency men," are going to ruin. It is a melancholy sight. But the strangest spectacle of all was a little wooden village built by the National League, wherein the smaller tenants are lodged. This is built in a field, rented by the parish priest in the heart of the estate, and proceedings are now being taken in Dublin to evict them all afresh. I visited several of these houses, and found the evicted tenants a quiet sensible class of men, not violent or extreme in their ideas, but anxious to come to a settlement. They would gladly purchase under the Ashbourne Act, if the landlord would fix what they consider a fair rent for a basis. Their wives were, in some cases, quite ladylike women, and the wooden houses were clean, capacious, and comfortable. The chief drawback was the want of employment, as no work could be got in the neighbourhood. One of the evicted tenants told me the history of his farm, which I give as a sample of the old Irish land system: In his father's time it was originally rented at 5*s.* an acre; then it was raised to 10*s.*, then to 12*s.* 6*d.*, then, as it was being constantly improved, to 20*s.*, and lastly to 25*s.* He said to me that it was simply a fine upon industry; and this is in brief the history of Ireland until Mr. Gladstone's land legislation commenced.

One could not but be struck by the ridiculous situation in which all concerned had placed themselves on the Lugnacurran estate. Here was the landlord allowing his property to go to ruin through bad management, here were the tenants eager for work, yet condemned to idleness, afraid to leave the neighbourhood lest their farms should be taken by strangers, for I was told that as long as they lived in these huts no tenants could be got to take their farms. Commonsense would point out that a settlement could be made if false pride were set aside. I feel sure that if the noble owner of the estate could see for himself the situation he would reinstate the tenants under the Act of 1887, and let them buy their farms under the Ashbourne Act.

I may add that these people have nearly all of them relatives in Australia or America, some holding good positions, and these friends used to remit money to aid them to pay their rents, but now they decline to do that, as they conceive, and rightly so, that the land should yield its own rent.

This leads me to say that the rental of Ireland has been unduly raised in past years through subsidies received by the tenants from their friends abroad. The landlords have not fully recognized this, and in many cases fight against the inevitable law that is forcing rent down to the proper agricultural value of the land, and it will be incumbent in any scheme of land purchase that a true valuation of the land be taken, so that the nation does not pledge its credit for more than the commercial value of the landlord's interest.

I may further add that I found only one opinion in Ireland among all classes, viz., that the final solution of the agrarian difficulty must be found in some scheme of land purchase whereby the tenant would become in time the sole owner of the land. It is admitted on all hands that the dual ownership has proved a failure. To use a vulgar simile,

it is like tying a cat and a dog together; it involves incessant friction, at least in so many cases as to keep Ireland in perpetual disquiet. The real question that all parties are trying to face is how to get out of this intolerable situation. Many of the existing disputes are really caused by each party trying to get a vantage ground for the final settlement. The tenants naturally want to beat down the rent so as to form a safe basis for purchase; the landlords wish to keep it up, so as to get all they can when the settling day comes. I should think most of the tenants would be prepared to buy on the basis of fifteen to twenty years' purchase; fifteen years when they consider the rent a full one, and twenty years when the rent is an easy one. But the "congested districts" must be dealt with separately; they are covered with a mass of small tenants paying from £1 to £5 rental.[1] This property is no more safe for the State to advance upon than workmen's cottages in a poverty-stricken and decaying town. The whole value is but small. I doubt whether the fair value is more than ten years' purchase, and I doubt whether the total rental of these districts exceeds £200,000 or £300,000 a year (I speak without exact data). Suppose the State were to buy all this property for £2,000,000 or £3,000,000, and present it to the tenants, it would be a good bargain; it would stop evictions over a large area, and make the people deeply grateful. It is true it would not lift them from poverty; they would starve whenever the potatoes failed, and no permanent cure could be effected without emigration or migration. But a legislature in Dublin could best undertake this work; it would have to be done sympathetically, and would only be resented by these poor people if done from Westminster.

But the greater part of Ireland is now thinly peopled. The land could easily maintain the present population, or even more; and there is a fair basis for purchase on adequate security if the tenants really resolved to pay up their instalments to the State, say under the name of the land tax. It would be better to abolish the term "rent," as it has become so odious. I am obliged, however, to say that I found the strongest opinion that it would not be safe to advance this money directly from the Imperial Exchequer without the interposition of an Irish representative body, which would be bound to collect the instalments. All to whom I spoke consider it would be a dangerous thing to make the British Government the landlord of Ireland, and to have on its hands the enormous task of collecting money from half a million of tenants. The operation of buying out the Irish landlords is a gigantic affair, and it will need the greatest caution in its inception, and, above all, the hearty support of the people and their representatives. If we have that hearty support I believe it might be accomplished without any loss to the Exchequer. Similar operations have been performed with entire success in Germany on even a larger scale.

It would be a misfortune were the landlords entirely to leave Ireland, as they will be left with their houses and demesne lands, often very beautiful. It is hoped that many of them may remain and take part in the national life. No cause for friction would then exist, and they

[1] 120,000 tenants under £5.

might be useful at home in place of idling away their time in England or on the Continent. However, I fear that many will have saved little or nothing out of the wreck of their fortunes. Already Ireland is full of beautiful mansions standing empty and going to decay. No one can now be found to lease them or rent them. The loss to the country is very great. All employment ceases except the commonest sort of farm labour, and large districts present the appearance of a dead level of poor peasants; nothing can exceed the dreariness of the small country towns. Places like Thurles or Cashel to a British eye appear stagnant and decaying; houses are tumbling down on all sides, and hardly a new house is being built. A monotonous level of poverty prevails, and in many of the small towns there is hardly a decent inn to accommodate the visitor. Ireland sorely needs the introduction of capital, and some variety of social position to enliven the monotony of the rural districts.

The education question in Ireland is one of no small difficulty, and is one that interested me exceedingly. I visited several of the schools in and around Dublin, and will recite what I saw before dealing with the main question:—

The finest educational establishment within Dublin itself is the Central Model Schools, of Marlborough Street. These are a group of schools admirably arranged in a semicircle, with every modern appliance. Some 1,800 children attend them, and 200 young teachers are there trained for their profession. It is, in fact, a large training college, with a series of practising schools attached to it. I never saw a more perfect system of elementary education. Not only the ordinary branches were taught, but much technical education as well. I was delighted with the Kindergarten system as applied to the young children, and with the workshop where the male teachers were taught the use of tools and joinery work; and a capital cookery depôt, where the female teachers were thoroughly trained in this most useful art. One could not help feeling that when these teachers are dispersed over Ireland they will carry endless blessings in their train. There is nothing that Ireland needs more than technical or industrial education. The peasantry are mostly ignorant of common handicrafts; their houses fall out of repair for want of tools; their diet is of the poorest, and cookery is almost a lost art. The whole face of Ireland would be changed in the next generation if the people could be taught to use their hands, and the Irish emigrant would double his chances of success in the new countries of the world. I am sorry, however, to state that this admirable institution is not popular with the Catholic clergy. It is, so far as I could learn, the sole successful experiment of mixed schools in the Catholic part of Ireland, and the Irish priesthood are strongly opposed to mixed education. They claim that Catholics shall be separately educated, alike in schools and colleges, as they regard the mixing with Protestants a danger to their faith.

Another school that interested me extremely was the great Industrial School at Artane, taught and managed by the Christian Brothers, a religious teaching order which has about 60 schools in Ireland, some

of them of great size. The school at Artane corresponds with our industrial schools, being composed of boys committed for begging, or deserted by their parents, but not criminals; 800 of these boys are brought up at Artane until they are 16 years of age, when they are apprenticed to trades. I have visited many industrial schools and reformatories in England, but never saw one so perfectly equipped as that at Artane. It is a surprising sight: a series of splendid buildings costing £80,000, with a large farm attached, and every facility for training the boys in all sorts of trades as well as farm work. It is like a little Manchester and Sheffield rolled into one, without the smoke or disagreeables. There are, I think, 16 different workshops, some of them well provided with steam engines and machinery, where the boys learn to be weavers, engine fitters, plumbers, cabinet-makers, tailors, shoemakers, smiths, plasterers, masons, barbers, farm labourers, etc. All the trades are taught by skilled lay brothers or clever artisans; a hum of happy busy life pervades the whole place, and I never saw more healthy-looking boys. Besides this they have three hours a day of elementary education, and when they are turned out at 16 there is a great competition to get them, and almost all do well in future life. These lay brothers devote themselves for life to education, and receive no recompense—it is purely a labour of love. I am told they have an equally fine institution at Cork, and I went over one of their elementary schools in Dublin, where 800 boys are taught with much ability, and they are carried on so far that 70 of them are learning Latin, and large numbers elementary science, so much so that they receive a grant from South Kensington of, I think, over £600 a year.

The peculiar feature of these "Christian Brothers'" schools is that they are purely voluntary, and they are not under Government inspection, and receive no grants for ordinary elementary teaching. They decline to place themselves under the Education Department, as it would involve the removal of Catholic symbols, and the restriction of religious instruction to certain hours under the conscience clause.

There is also a large class of convent schools taught by nuns on similar principles, and largely attended.

I mention these facts to show how powerful a place the denominational element plays in Irish education. I will now describe, as briefly as possible, the main features of the Irish system of education. It was stated some fifty years ago that Ireland had a national system of education long before England, but it has never had School Boards or elected bodies to manage the schools. Each school is recognized that complies with certain conditions, and submits to inspection, and grants are given on results, but not to the extreme degree to which the system has been pushed in Great Britain.

The Education Department deals with each school through a patron or manager, who is usually the parish priest or Protestant clergyman, and who appoints the teachers; and so in its essence the school is denominational, but in its origin it was intended to be a mixed system, where Protestants and Catholics should be educated together, getting their religious instruction separately. Nothing could be wiser or more

liberal than this system in theory. A National Board was constituted in Dublin, composed equally of Protestants and Catholics, and rules were laid down to prevent the schools being used for proselytizing, and the consciences of all were to be respected ; but the logic of fact has shaped it into a denominational system. The Catholics, speaking broadly, only attend Catholic schools, and the Protestants those of their own faith. Comparatively few Catholics, and still fewer Protestants, attend mixed schools, and in the existing condition of Ireland it is quite impossible to alter these facts. The whole Irish population, it may be said broadly, is deeply convinced of the need of religious education, and no scheme will work in Ireland that ignores this fact.

In my judgment it is hopeless to attempt to control Irish education from this side of the Channel, and it is equally unjust. The people of Ireland have as much right to control their education as those of England or Scotland, and this subject can be dealt with far better by a body in Dublin, responsible to the people, than by one at Westminster.

I would further add that I found on all sides evidence of the excellent effect of English and Scotch visits to Ireland. It gives the people assurance of our sympathy, and confidence in our justice. It would be well if all M.P.'s could spend a few weeks in Ireland, looking at things with independent eyes.

Nothing moves the Irish heart more than sympathy ; not patronage, which they detest, but that broad feeling of humanity which makes all true and good hearted men brothers. The chief fault of England is want of sympathy with other types of nationality, and a foolish underestimate of all that differs from her national type. This self conceit accounts for much of the misgovernment of Ireland. A truer conception of the just rights of others is a feature of the times we live in. We are learning that Nature has not framed mankind on one block, and that there is room for great variety of institutions corresponding with the different types of nationhood. Ireland, left free to shape her domestic institutions, will produce a type different from ours, but more suited to herself ; and it would be folly for us to ridicule or decry her on that account. Let us rather show a hearty good will to all that makes for her peace and prosperity, and exchange the attitude of barren criticism for the spirit of brotherly sympathy.

I took hardly as much public work in hand this winter as formerly owing to the state of my health, for I was increasingly troubled with nervous indigestion, the result of over brain work. But I venture to call attention to one address, delivered at Garston at the end of the year, upon the difficulties of the Home Rule question. The more I pondered the subject the greater appeared the difficulties connected with the representation of Ireland in the Imperial Parliament. Public opinion had rejected Mr. Gladstone's first solution of the exclusion of Irish members from the Imperial Parliament, and now it was clear that the only remaining alter-

native was Irish representation at Westminster. But this raised a new set of difficulties, if possible, even greater. One result was to start schemes for the federalizing of the British Empire. My study of the United States satisfied me that it was not possible to convert the British Constitution into a Federal system of government, and I delivered a lecture at Garston at the end of the year, in which I ventured to suggest a solution on different lines. The bulk of this lecture I reprint in the Appendix (X.). The question of federalizing the Empire is sure to arise again, and it may interest those who have studied this question to see the grounds on which I think it is not applicable to the United Kingdom. The experience of the Home Rule Bill in 1893 proves conclusively that this question of the representation of Irish members was the rock on which it split. For that reason I am now opposed to what may be called the Gladstonian solution of Irish Home Rule, though I believe that much more can yet be done in the way of devolving local affairs on provincial bodies.

CHAPTER XXX

Session of 1890—Bimetallism again—"The Publicans' Compensation Bill"—The Madagascar Question

BEFORE Parliament opened in 1890 we went to Lausanne and placed my son and his companion with their tutor there, to spend some time in acquiring French. The cold was intense and we felt it severely, but the views of the snow-clad Alps were beautiful. Parliament met on February 10, and we were soon plunged into bitter debates on the report of the Parnell Commission. As I have already observed, Mr. Parnell and the Irish leaders generally were acquitted of the serious crimes charged against them, but were held guilty of the minor charges of intimidation and boycotting. The general feeling of the House was that the *Times* had overshot the mark, and there was a revulsion of feeling both in Parliament and all over the country in favour of Mr. Parnell and the Nationalist Party, which Mr. Gladstone took full advantage of. The most important step I took this Session was to raise a debate on the bimetallic question on April 18. I succeeded in getting first place on Tuesday, and the entire sitting was devoted to this intricate question. In the previous Session, when I seconded Mr. Chaplin's motion, we had only an evening sitting, but in this case we had a debate lasting for seven or eight hours, of the most exhaustive kind and sustained with great ability. I spoke for an hour and twenty minutes, and was seconded by Sir William Houldsworth, of Manchester, in an able speech. We were strongly opposed by Sir William Harcourt, speaking for Mr. Gladstone as well as for himself; also by W. H. Smith, the Leader of the House, and Sir Lyon Playfair. We were ably supported by A. J. Balfour; also by Sir Henry James, Sir Edward Clarke and Sir Richard Webster, then Attorney-General. The debate was wound up by Mr. Goschen, Chancellor of the Exchequer, who adopted an attitude of benevolent neutrality. He conceded much of what we

claimed, but stated on behalf of the Government that it was impossible for them to act in view of the opposition of the City of London and the banking interest generally. Few men understood this question better than Mr. Goschen. He had been a delegate to one of the two International Conferences held at Paris, and had strongly opposed the demonetization of silver. Had the Report of the Currency Commission, presided over by Lord Herschell, been given before these Conferences met in Paris, in 1878 and 1881, there might have been some chance of International action. But unfortunately it was delayed too long. The critical moment had passed, and most of the commercial nations had elected to employ gold as their sole standard. Yet it is worth recounting that that Commission which approached the question strongly prejudiced against our views, came unanimously to the following conclusion :—

(Sec.107.) We think that in any conditions fairly to be contemplated in the future, so far as we can forecast them from the experience of the past, a stable ratio might be maintained if the nations we have alluded to (the United Kingdom, Germany, the United States and the Latin Union) were to accept and strictly adhere to bimetallism at the suggested ratio. We think that if in all these countries gold and silver could be freely coined and thus become exchangeable against commodities at the fixed ratio, the market value of silver as measured by gold would conform to that ratio, and not vary to any material extent."

Well might we say that in the affairs of nations as of men : "There is a tide which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune " ; but let the favourable moment pass and the case becomes lost. We never after this got a more favourable opportunity of moving public opinion. The decision of the House was decidedly against us, the voting being 87 for, and 183 against, the motion. The case was vigorously agitated in America for some years longer, and a large addition was made to the silver coinage in that country, but so far as England was concerned it went backward, and it became clear to me that the chance of an international arrangement had practically passed away. As I have already observed, the vast increase of gold production from South Africa, Klondyke and other places altered the situation entirely, and when the Indian currency was adjusted a few years later there was no longer a *raison d'être* for England changing her system. So after this date I ceased to work much at this question.

Part of the time of this Session was occupied by an Irish Land

Purchase bill, which was withdrawn; but a similar bill was introduced and passed into law in the following Session.

The most interesting event for the remainder of the Session was what was called the "Publicans' Compensation Bill." In a grant made towards Local Taxation Mr. Goschen inserted a clause granting to local authorities considerable sums derived from drink licences. These sums were to be spent on buying up superfluous licences at the discretion of the local authorities. The object was to conciliate the Temperance Party on the one hand, and to satisfy the drink interest on the other; but this policy turned out an utter failure. It was quickly perceived that its effect was to give a vested interest to licensed victuallers in what had been held by the Courts of Law to be only an annual grant. The whole Temperance Party united to oppose this concession. My friend, Mr. Caine, took the lead, and in a series of speeches of great ability showed how it would impose on the country an enormous pecuniary liability. The Government majority steadily fell off till at last on one occasion it ran down to four. The Government was shaken to its foundation, and had at length to withdraw this obnoxious clause. The question then arose, What should be done with the grant, amounting to about £800,000 per annum? Mr. Acland,[1] by a happy inspiration, proposed that it should be given to local bodies for technical education. The idea was accepted on both sides of the House and, I may say, almost instantaneously commended itself to Parliament. So one of the most valuable reforms in our time was carried by what I may call a "fluke," and to this day what is called the "whisky money" has done splendid work in building up technical education.

It became clear during this Session that the Government was losing popularity, and that the country was going round to Mr. Gladstone; and when the Session came to an end it was not expected that the Unionist Government would hold power much longer.

This summer was unusually wet and cold. The harvest was bad. In July the thermometer once stood at 53° in London, and we were glad to have fires. Neither my own health nor that of my wife was very good, and I was glad to get down to Orchill in the second week of August, after making a speech against handing over Madagascar unconditionally to French rule. That island had been virtually civilized and christianized by missionaries of the London Society. It was developing a native civilization of a very high

[1] I believe this proposal was in the first instance made by Mr. Caine.

order. The French had done nothing for it and had no rights; but Lord Salisbury, as part of a general arrangement for Africa, resigned the British rights in Madagascar in favour of France, and failed to take adequate security for the rights of the British missionaries and their converts. A period of persecution followed. The Protestant missionaries were expelled from the island under Jesuit influence. The native churches and schools were closed, and every effort was made to detach the Malagasy from the Protestant faith. I raised the question again and again in Parliament; but I am glad to add that France has entirely altered her policy of late years. Religious liberty is now freely conceded; the Protestant Christians have got back their churches and schools and, so far as I know, reparation has been made for the wrongs committed ten years ago.

CHAPTER XXXI

Trip to the West Highlands—The Baring Crisis—The Fall of Mr. Parnell—General Booth's "Darkest England" Scheme

I GOT down to Orchill in the second week of August, feeling tired and not very well. It was a very wet season and unusually cold, and we scarcely derived as much benefit as usual from our autumn holiday. Towards the end of September I took Mrs. Smith a short trip to the West Highlands. We sailed from Oban to Portree, in the Isle of Skye, on a day of dazzling purity, and the scenery remains imprinted on my memory to this day. I know nothing finer than the West Highlands when seen in bright clear weather. Sir George Trevelyan was one of our passengers, and I attended with him a meeting of crofters at Portree. The question of the Crofters' Act was then agitating the Highlands. I am glad to say that before long it was carried into law, giving fixity of tenure and fair rents to a large number of small holders in the West Highlands. I only regret that it was not passed many years before. It would have stopped the depopulation of many of our Highland glens. Sir George Trevelyan was a true friend of all oppressed classes. His temporary departure from the Liberal fold was soon retraced, and he became again a warm supporter of Mr. Gladstone's policy towards Ireland.

We returned to Liverpool in October, and I took some part in the municipal elections of that year, which turned very much on temperance and purity questions. The policy advocated by the Conservatives was strongly challenged by the Liberals, who carried the great majority of seats that were contested, and the effect was a complete *bouleversement* in the *laissez faire* policy, and a wonderful improvement in the moral conduct of Liverpool. I went as usual through my constituency, visiting the principal towns, and found, as I always experienced in Flintshire, a most cordial reception:

No member could have had more happy relations with his constituency than I have had during my sixteen years' experience.

About this time the commercial world passed through a spasm of great anxiety. The great financial house of Baring Bros. became embarrassed. Their liabilities were enormous. A panic spread through the commercial world, but it was averted by the courageous conduct of the Bank of England, led by its able chairman, Mr. Lidderdale. This great institution opened a guarantee account, which was subscribed to by the leading bankers in the country, and reached the astonishing total of £15,000,000. On the strength of this the Bank undertook to carry out the liquidation of Messrs. Baring's liabilities, and the whole estate was ultimately wound up without loss to any one, and it left an ample surplus. The honoured name of Baring remained unblemished, and their business has been carried on successfully in a reconstructed form.

In the political sphere a startling denouement now appeared. The Irish Home Rule cause was bound up with Mr. Parnell as much as the old Irish Nationalist movement was with Dan O'Connell. Parnell and Home Rule were indeed synonymous, but a sudden bolt from the blue shattered the power and influence of Parnell throughout Great Britain. The disgraceful revelations of the O'Shea divorce case entirely destroyed Mr. Parnell's credit, and made it impossible for Mr. Gladstone to co-operate with him as leader of the Irish Party. But this at the outset was not the view taken by the Nationalist members. After many stormy meetings of the Party in Committee Room 15 Parnell was re-elected chairman. It was only when Mr. Gladstone in a dignified letter declined to co-operate with the Irish leader that the necessity of parting with Parnell became clear to the bulk of the Nationalist Party. But Parnell himself declined to be put aside. He had extraordinary influence over the Irish peasantry, and he resolved to fight the majority of his own Parliamentary Party rather than lay aside his almost regal position. A complete split occurred amongst the Irish Nationalists. A small section of the Party espoused the cause of Parnell, but it had a large support in Ireland. Mr. Healy led the section opposed to Parnell, and had the support of the great body of the priesthood. For a long time the Irish Party was paralysed by internal dissensions, and it looked as if the cause of Home Rule was lost. Since the theft of Marie Antoinette's diamond necklace no private event has had such far-reaching influence in public affairs. It is by no means certain even yet whether the

downfall of Parnell was not the ultimate cause of the failure of Home Rule. It had no real relation to the question of national policy, but personal feeling always plays a great part in politics, and the Irish have never since had a leader with the prestige and commanding influence of Charles Stewart Parnell. Though anticipating a little, I may add that the course of Mr. Parnell was steadily downward. His fall was irretrievable. The Irish people have very strong moral sentiments, and when the facts filtered through the peasant population, their loyalty to Parnell was at last completely broken. After vain attempts which in a better cause might be called heroic, Parnell died, a broken-hearted man; and, like Alexander the Great, he left his crown to be fought for amongst his generals, and it is only after several years of intestine strife that the Irish Party has regained unity under its present able leader, Mr. John Redmond.

A short autumn Session was held this year, beginning in the last week of November. Owing to the absence of the Irish and the suspense caused by the ambiguous position of Parnell, the Government got through their work very quickly, and the House rose early in December. At this time great interest was excited in philanthropic circles by General Booth's "Darkest England" scheme. I presided for him at a huge meeting in Hengler's Circus, Liverpool, attended by 4,000 people. We gave him an enthusiastic welcome. He laid before us his scheme for raising the social condition of what he called "the submerged tenth," by which I mean that hopeless and depraved class which infests our large cities, among whom I had worked for several years in Liverpool before entering Parliament. He asked for a capital sum of £100,000, and £30,000 a year to start training homes and industrial farms for reclaiming these outcasts. I warmly sympathized with his work, and visited his homes in London and his model farm of Hadleigh, in Essex, and believe that great good has resulted. He stayed with me in Liverpool, and I was impressed with the commanding power and enthusiasm of that old man, who had a military bearing which justified the term "General." I believe the Salvation Army has been a great power for good, not only in England, but throughout the world. He had at this time 10,000 "officers" under the strictest military control —I suppose largely increased since then. I never could quite approve of the autocratic rule and the military discipline of the Salvation Army. It resembles too much the Jesuit Order, which also commenced with a leader—Loyola—of undoubted purity of

motive and exalted sentiments. Human nature cannot be trusted with absolute power either in Church or State. Ignatius Loyola or General Booth may pass through life immaculate, but you cannot ensure immaculate successors. While gladly recognizing the splendid work of the Army, and the marvellous self-denial it has evoked, I doubt whether its religious influence will be permanently maintained.

The year 1890 closed with intense cold. For several weeks snow lay on the ground, and early in 1891 the Thames was frozen quite thick, and waggons and carriages crossed on the ice at Oxford. The thermometer dropped at various points to zero. I suffered much from indigestion and weakness, and Mrs. Smith was also in poor health; and early in 1891, after placing our son at Oxford, we took a short run to Cannes. There we spent three delightful weeks before the opening of Parliament. We found central France frozen as hard as iron, deep snow piled along the roadside. Even along the Riviera the snow wreaths still lay in masses; but a sudden change of weather took place when we reached Cannes, and we had three weeks of delightful sunshine, so that I came back to London refreshed for the Session of 1891.

CHAPTER XXXII

Session of 1891—Death of W. H. Smith—Irish Land Purchase Bill—Opium Trade Resolution—I Visit the Cambridge Union—Death of Parnell—Licensing Reform in Liverpool

THE weather was extremely trying in London this spring. We had dense fogs which lasted for weeks. There were several days in which we could not see across the street, and had to burn gas all day. We had also great snowstorms and excessive cold. Influenza of a severe kind was extremely prevalent: we had fifty or sixty M.P.'s laid up with it. The work of Parliament dragged rather heavily this year. The Leader of the House, Mr. W. H. Smith, was in poor health, being worn out with excessive labour, and died towards the end of the year. One of the interesting events of the Session was Mr. Gladstone's declaration in favour of Welsh Disestablishment. This committed the Liberal Party to the greatest of all Welsh causes, and produced great satisfaction in my constituency. But the chief event of the Session was the declaration of the Government in favour of free education. No doubt it was largely owing to Mr. Chamberlain's influence. Mr. Goschen made provision in his Budget for remitting fees in elementary schools, and an Act was passed later in the Session with the concurrence of all sides of the House. Much of the Session was occupied with the Irish Land Purchase Bill. It went through the House very slowly. It was a highly complex measure with restrictions of all kinds to guard the National Exchequer against loss. It placed £30,000,000 at the disposal of the tenants of Ireland to purchase their farms from the landlords by mutual agreement. The money was only to be advanced if the Land Commission were satisfied that the security was ample. The restrictions have proved to be too elaborate, and little use has been made of this measure, so that Parliament has again been called upon this Session (1902) to open

up the subject afresh, as I have already said. During the Easter Recess I attended the meetings of the Welsh Liberal Federation at Blaenau Festiniog. It was intensely cold, the snow falling heavily. The Marquis of Ripon attended our meetings and addressed us. He was paraded through the streets in a snowstorm in an open carriage. I sincerely pitied him!

Perhaps the most striking event of the Session was a vote of condemnation passed on the opium trade by the House of Commons in the month of April. Sir Joseph Pease moved a resolution similar to the one I moved two years before, when I was defeated; but he carried it by a majority of thirty, to our great delight. I cannot account for this sudden change, except through the influence of a convention that sat in London on the opium question, and which roused deep feeling throughout the country. As I have already observed, this declaration has not led to much practical result. The Government gave a promise that the area devoted to opium would be gradually restricted, but it has not been acted upon. We also carried through Parliament a Factory Act Amendment Bill. My old friend, Mr. Barbour, M.P. for Paisley, died of influenza in the month of May. We had been fast friends for thirty or forty years, and I felt his loss very much. He was buried in Paisley with great demonstrations of sorrow. He was much respected in his constituency. So great was the mortality this year that five M.P.'s died in a fortnight. Our own household was full of influenza. The very air of London at that time seemed to be tainted. I may mention an interesting incident which happened about this time. I was invited to speak at the Cambridge Union upon a debate on the opium question. I found myself in a crowded meeting of young men; and when I was in the middle of my speech an old white-haired gentleman walked up the room, causing a buzz of excitement. When I had finished the gentleman rose to reply to me and proved to be Sir Thomas Wade, our Ambassador in China, who negotiated the Treaty of Tientsin. This old man eloquent spoke for an hour with much force, and made out a better case than I would have supposed possible, considering the admissions he had made in his own dispatches, which I have already quoted. He had been a member of the Cambridge Union more than fifty years before. He carried the vote against me by a small majority; but at the Oxford Union the decision was given on the anti-opium side. This was the high-water mark of the anti-opium agitation. Since then the subject has gone back, and at present it may be pronounced in a moribund

condition. Like other great moral causes it will revive again, and I trust that even yet our country will clear itself from this stain on its escutcheon.

During July the German Emperor visited London. He was very popular at that time, and he was present at a great Volunteer Review at Wimbledon, when 22,000 London Volunteers marched passed him. It was an imposing sight. On the Indian Budget that autumn I had the first place with a motion urging the election of native members to the Legislative Councils. Owing to a technical breach of order I was prevented from moving the motion, but made my speech when we went into committee, with Mr. Courtney in the Chair. This concession was made in a partial degree by a Bill carried a few years afterwards.

I got down to Scotland early in August. The autumn was very wet: the harvest was much injured. I had increasing anxiety about the health of my wife, yet we had as usual a happy household of friends and visitors, and returned refreshed to Liverpool in October. W. H. Smith and Parnell both died that month. There was something tragic about the death of the Irish Leader. He was fighting a hopeless campaign in Ireland to recover his lost power, and went about addressing meetings almost in a dying state. Even his death did not extinguish the Parnellite party, which went on for several years separate from, and opposed to, the rest of the Nationalists. I may mention that I went up to the Liverpool Licensing Sessions in September, when a new departure was made by the magistrates, which was greatly conducive to sobriety and good conduct in Liverpool. After long and earnest discussion we agreed to put public houses under a stricter régime, and declined to renew licences when the conduct of the house had not been good. The decision of the House of Lords in the famous case of Sharp *v.* Wakefield had proved that publicans did not possess a vested interest in their licences, and that magistrates had the full right of using their discretion. I think our borough was the first to put in practice this version of the law; and ever since our licensing Bench, ably presided over by Sir Thomas Hughes, has curbed the abuses of the drink trade, and pruned off superfluous licences. The result has been a wonderful improvement in the conduct of public houses, and a great decrease of drunkenness and immorality.

CHAPTER XXXIII

Trip to Italy—Visit to Mount Vesuvius—Amalfi—Session of 1892—India—Welsh Disestablishment—Women's Suffrage—The Kanaka Labour Traffic—General Election—Returned for Flintshire for the Third Time—Illness and Death of Mrs. Smith—Session of 1893—Second Home Rule Bill

THE health of Mrs. Smith steadily grew worse this autumn, and caused us great anxiety. She suffered greatly from neuralgia in the head, and sickness in the morning, with attacks of bronchitis superadded. I was ordered to take her to a warmer climate, and we decided to go to Italy. We started on December 21, a party of four—my son, who had just attained his majority, and my old friend, Dr. Lundie, who was also in failing health, being with us. We arrived in Rome on the morning of Christmas Day, and spent a little time there; but it was cold and damp, and my invalid did not improve, and we were glad to go to the warmer climate of Naples. There we had very wet weather, but on occasional fine days made out excursions to Pompeii, that wonderful resurrection of old Roman life; to Baiae, where the wealthy Romans had their marine villas; to Avernus, where the underground grotto suggested to Virgil the descent to Hades, and where the subterranean Styx is crossed by a modern Charon; and, most interesting of all, we ascended Vesuvius. I extract a short account from my journal:—

On Tuesday Dr. Lundie, Gordon and I ascended Vesuvius. It proved to be a fine day, and we telephoned to Cook's agents in the morning to provide a carriage, but owing to delays we did not get away till 11 a.m.—much too late.

We took four hours to drive to the foot of the funicular railway, ascending 2,500 feet and getting splendid views of Naples and its bay. Went up the giddy ascent by railway in seven minutes—very cold; then ten minutes' walk led us to the top, 4,200 feet high. Some snow on the ground. There was mist on the top, and we could not

see into the crater, but heard the noise of the volcano sighing and groaning with occasional explosions which threw up stones.

Our next interesting experience was a visit to the lava stream issuing from a hollow some 1,500 feet below the top. We scrambled down to it through soft scoriae and over heaps of calcined lava, very difficult to walk on. At last we reached the edge of a small stream of red-hot lava flowing slowly—heat so great we could hardly bear to dip our sticks into it. Two other streams a little beyond us—a strange, weird sight in the dusk. Never saw such a scene of desolation. Got back to our carriage at dark, and drove to Naples by bright moonlight, tired, but well satisfied with our day's work.

We went on to Sorrento, charmingly situated on the Bay of Naples, from which we visited the Island of Capri, where the tyrant Tiberius spent his last years and wrote the epistle which sealed the fate of Sejanus; then went to Amalfi by way of La Cava, and paid a visit to the wonderful Greek temples of Paestum, a striking survival of Magna Graecia 500 years before Christ. A splendid temple, modelled on the Parthenon of Athens, still stands almost intact in a desolate region, recalling the age of Pericles and Phidias. I have seldom been more touched by any monument of the past.

The road to Amalfi is hewn out of the cliff that overlooks the gulf of Salerno. It is one of the most picturesque in Europe. It is now carried on, I believe, round the promontory to Sorrento, and rivals, if it does not surpass, the Corniche drive along the Riviera. The Hotel Cappucini, above Amalfi—an old monastery—is perched on the edge of the cliff, and seems inaccessible when looked at from beneath. It is approached by a corkscrew road up the side of the precipice, and there we found comfortable quarters. A few years ago a sad accident happened—I think from an earthquake shock. A portion of the hotel fell over the cliff, carrying some of the visitors with it, and the daughter of a friend of mine, an M.P., was killed. There we spent a pleasant week, and then turned homewards in time for the meeting of Parliament on February 9.

I spoke the first night on the condition of India, and again had an opportunity of pleading its cause on the Indian Councils Bill, which gave the first slight instalment of representative members to the Presidency towns. It was a move in the right direction, and must be extended further.

I was fortunate in drawing the first place in the ballot for a motion on Welsh Disestablishment on February 23, but unluckily caught influenza a few days before. I urged my doctor to fit me for my motion, even if the strongest medicines were used. He gave

me a sweating powder, which removed the fever the night before my motion came on. I got up next afternoon, went over to the House, and made my speech in a very weakly condition. I waited to hear the reply by Sir Edward Clarke, and then returned to bed, none the worse for the experiment, but I should not like to repeat it. The motion was defeated by 47 votes. The Liberal Party had now fully adopted this policy, and all voted for it. Death was very busy at this time. Influenza was all over London. Several in our household were down with it. Mr. Spurgeon died, and I heard his funeral sermon preached by Dr. Pierson of Philadelphia, to a vast congregation. Sir George Campbell, that indefatigable Parliamentarian, but garrulous speaker, died of this scourge. A feeling of depression prevailed through the country. Business was very bad, and a period of falling prices had set in, which went on without a break till 1896, when the lowest prices of the century were reached.

The important subject of Women's Suffrage was debated in a full house this Session, and with more ability than I have heard before or since. It was then a burning question. Most of the Liberal Party were pledged to it, and a large number of Conservatives, especially Arthur Balfour, who was now the Leader of the House. I had at one time leant towards it, influenced by a strong desire to remove women's wrongs, and conscious that in moral questions women's instincts were generally truer than men's. I had not then contemplated any extension beyond household suffrage for either sex, and it seemed to me that the moderate number of women-householders who were already enfranchised for town and county councils—about one-seventh of the whole electorate—might be safely entrusted with the Parliamentary vote as well. I am still of this opinion, were it possible to confine the suffrage to a household basis, but it became plain that it could not stand permanently on that narrow ledge. The almost universal practice of manhood suffrage in all neighbouring countries and in our colonies showed that sooner or later the United Kingdom must follow their example. It became clear, therefore, that if women received the political suffrage it must be on the same basis as men, and we should have to contemplate its extension sooner or later to all adults, both male and female. This would give women voters a majority of nearly a million in our country, and practically shift the centre of gravity from men to women. When we bear in mind that the vast majority of our women know nothing and care nothing about politics, that most of them are workmen's

wives or domestic servants or factory workers, the risk of entrusting them with a controlling power over the government of 400 millions of human beings appears obvious.

It was this consideration that influenced me to move the rejection of Sir Albert Rollit's Bill to enfranchise women. I received a letter from Mr. Gladstone (afterwards published as a pamphlet), giving me his support.[1] I was seconded by that genial old Tory, Sir Walter Barttelot, and supported in very able speeches by Mr. Bryce and Mr. Asquith. We were opposed by Mr. Wyndham, Mr. Courtney and Mr. Arthur Balfour, and we defeated the Bill by 175 to 152.

It seems to me that the cause has greatly declined since then. Recent debates have not been serious. It has become clear that many who had given promises at election times to curry favour with lady supporters did not in their hearts believe in it, and obstructionist tactics have been resorted to in order to prevent full discussion. Meanwhile the movement is slowly progressing in the newer countries of the world. New Zealand has adopted it, and apparently its effect there has been imperceptible. Some remote parts of the United States have also tried it, but it is noticeable that wherever it is tried, it is on the basis of womanhood suffrage, and it is clear that it must come to that ultimately, if adopted at all.

I feel the hardship of a cultivated lady who owns her house being denied a vote which her butler or coachman possesses. Were it possible to enfranchise such women without all others following in their train I would gladly agree to it, but I see insuperable difficulties in drawing a line in this democratic age. The vote for local government has answered well. I am all in favour of women's work on school boards, poor law boards, etc., and would not object to women sitting on town and county councils. The suffrage will probably continue to rest on a ratepaying basis for such bodies, and therefore can be safely extended to qualified women, but I fear it cannot be long kept on this basis for Parliamentary purposes. I think this view now corresponds with that held by most sober politicians on both sides of the House, and I doubt if women suffrage will progress further at present.

Another subject that occupied me a good deal this Session was the renewal of the odious Kanaka labour traffic from the New Hebrides to Queensland. It had been little better than a disguised

[1] This is published in the Appendix (XI.)

form of slave trade, and was the subject of a Royal Commission in 1885. Their report brought to light some dreadful atrocities, and several regulations were laid down which it was hoped would purge it of these abuses. Unhappily the regulations proved to be futile, or at least very ineffective. Strong appeals were made to me by Dr. Paton, the venerable missionary to the New Hebrides, to save the islands from depopulation by what was little better than a system of man-stealing. I was supplied with painful evidence of the deceptions by which the simple islanders were decoyed on board the recruiting ships and forcibly carried away from their wives and families, often by revolting cruelty. I raised an important debate in Parliament and secured a strong expression of indignation, which had a wholesome effect in deterring the wrongdoers. I brought the subject up in the following Session, and more stringent regulations were framed, which checked most of the abuses. But I believe it is almost impossible to carry on any system of enforced coolie labour under the guise of apprenticeship without great evils arising. Nothing but the most vigilant watchfulness will prevent the white trader—often a bad specimen of his race—abusing his power over the ignorant coloured races. Even as regards the tea and indigo plantations of India I have had great complaints of the treatment of the labourers, and it is well known that the regulations at the mines of Johannesburg and Kimberley, and still more in Rhodesia, have at times dangerously approximated to a species of forced labour. I believe that immense advantage results to the weaker races of the world from having the platform of the British Parliament to expose these evils, and no restraint should be placed on our powers of free speech if the real welfare of our subject races is to be safeguarded.

In the spring of this year (1892) I experienced great anxiety about the health of my wife. Our doctor discovered that she was labouring under Bright's disease, and that it was of long standing. The growing weakness and liability to other ailments proceeded from this deadly and almost incurable complaint. A great blight fell upon my happy domestic life. She had been my helper and counsellor in all my public work since early manhood, and now I had to face the prospect of long-continued suffering and premature death. In our early married life she was much stronger than I; but as time went on I grew stronger and she grew weaker, and her wonderful capacity for management and her quick and clear-sighted intellect showed signs of weakening. The dissolution of

Parliament and the General Election came upon me during a time of great tension. I got my household down to Orchill at the Whitsuntide Recess, then came up to Parliament for the short time before the dissolution towards the end of June. I was opposed by Sir Robert Cunliffe, who stood as a Liberal Unionist, and had nearly three weeks incessant meetings in Flintshire—usually two or three daily. The main question was Home Rule for Ireland, and I was returned on July 15 by a majority of 1,452, against 1,510 in the previous contest. My friend, Mr. Herbert Lewis, also entered Parliament for the Flint boroughs by a majority of 350. The poll was announced after midnight at Flint, and I had to drive to Mold, where my headquarters were, and meet at every village a crowd of enthusiastic electors standing in the rain, though it was 2 a.m. when I entered Mold!

I immediately returned to Scotland to pass through a time of intense anxiety. My dear wife had a succession of attacks of bronchial asthma, sometimes so severe that she could scarcely breathe. At times these attacks lasted for several hours, and no relief could be obtained except by injections of morphia. We had some of our oldest and dearest friends with us, who comforted and supported us in this time of sore trial. Among them was my dear friend, W. P. Lockhart, who had recently himself recovered from a stroke of paralysis, and who was doomed to pass away the following year, soon after my wife. My dear old friend, Dr. Murray Mitchell and his wife (still alive), were also our guests. Their love and sympathy and prayers helped us to bear the terrible strain. For months my wife lay between life and death, but at last a temporary rally took place, and hope revived that at least a partial restoration was possible.

To return a little in my narrative, I should say that a short Session of Parliament took place in August to receive the resignation of the Ministry, as Mr. Gladstone had a majority all told of 42; but this composite body was very unreliable. It was made up of British Liberals and Irish Nationalists, who differed on many points, and it was soon found that the Liberal Government which succeeded Lord Salisbury had a most difficult task before them. I went up for a few days to give my vote on the question which turned out the Conservatives and brought in Mr. Gladstone. It took place on August 11, and the Government was defeated by 40 votes in a House consisting of 668 members, of which 665 took part in the division—an unprecedented circumstance.

For the first time since my boyhood I spent most of the winter in the country. My wife could not be moved from Orchill, but she rallied so much that she frequently got out for short drives even when the snow lay on the ground if the sun was shining. The aspect of the country, white with snow, and with bright sunshine and blue sky, was singularly beautiful and reminded me of the High Alps. We had hard frost that winter, and I revived my old fondness for curling—the Scotch national game—which I had not practised for 40 years! There is no game equal to it when the ice is keen and the day fine; but our fickle climate makes it very uncertain. That winter we witnessed the great Caledonian contest between the North and South of Scotland, played at Carsbreck, a few miles from my place. It was a pretty sight, with bright sun overhead and pure white snow on the ground. More than 150 rinks, and 1,200 players took part.

We continued at Orchill till the middle of January, sometimes buoyed up with periods of convalescence, and then thrown back into despondency by sad relapses. It was a most weary and trying illness. There were periods of terrible breathlessness which almost produced suffocation, and relief was only obtained by injecting morphia. My son gave up a term at Oxford to attend to his mother. They were devoted to each other, and he was seldom away from her side. He was a devoted son, and his companion, James Masson, was not less assiduous in his loving care. James was now a medical student at Edinburgh. That winter, though marked by excessive anxiety, was not without great compensations—a succession of visits from sympathising friends, leisure for reading and study, and freedom from the strain of public meetings. It is good to be sometimes forcibly withdrawn from the hurly-burly of life. We see things in truer proportion, and feel how much ado is made about things that are essentially trifles. As Burke once said on the death of a friend, "What shadows we are, and what shadows we pursue!" When the dearest on earth hangs between life and death, much of what the world calls success appears as the small dust in the balance. By the use of an invalid carriage we got up to Liverpool in the middle of January without injury to Mrs. Smith. But it soon became evident that the change was not beneficial. Further attacks supervened, and we had a time of great anxiety. I was only able to attend Parliament intermittently for the first month or two. My heart was not in it. I was summoned back on my way to hear Gladstone introduce his Home Rule Bill. A

MRS. SAMUEL SMITH

terrible crisis had set in. I arrived to find that relief had been given by morphia, and I had to wait from that time with the knowledge that life was slowly ebbing away. I missed the debate on the introduction of the second Home Rule Bill, and did not hear the wonderful speech in which the Grand Old Man of 83 expounded it for two and a quarter hours. As all the world knows, this scheme was based on continued representation at Westminster. The debate on its introduction lasted for a week. I just managed to get to London to vote on the Welsh Suspensory Bill (the first stage of Disestablishment), but was recalled by another crisis in Mrs. Smith's illness. I hardly left her from that till the end came on March 15, when that most loving and unselfish life came to an end. For nearly thirty years we had lived in unbroken union, sharing each other's thoughts and aims. I felt as though a large part of myself had been taken away. To Gordon the loss was irreparable, and to his friend and companion hardly less so. The love and sympathy of friends was most precious, and wonderfully supported us in that trying time. As these memorials will be read by some who knew and loved my wife, I think I may venture to extract from my journal one out of several reminiscences, almost too sacred for disclosure :—

A few days before she died she was exhausted by an attack of breathlessness. The doctor arrived at six p.m., and saw at once that morphia must be injected. He did so, and in two minutes the hard breathing disappeared, and in a few minutes more she was sound asleep, and slept nearly twenty-four hours, only waking for a few minutes at a time to say how peaceful she felt. She told me she had such a deep sense of peace. She once said, "I feel such peace, whether in life or death." She says for the sake of Gordon and me she wishes to live, but she has no fear of death for herself. All this day she has been tranquil and happy. She said to me more than once: "I feel so happy; this illness has drawn us all so close together"; and she expressed her admiration of the way Gordon had nursed her. She also spoke of the great devotion of all the servants, and seemed full of the kindest thoughts of every one.

She was buried in Toxteth Cemetery on March 18. My dear friend, W. P. Lockhart, who had known her all our married life, gave a beautiful address, from which I venture to extract the following :—

There was in dear Mrs. Smith a rare combination of qualities, and doubtless it was that combination which gave her such a deservedly

high place in the regard of all her many friends. She had a manly robustness of intellect, without, however, anything masculine, for she had genuine womanly grace and much delicacy and tenderness. Her strong will and natural force of character were blended with true consideration and sympathy shown in an earnest desire to promote the happiness of others. The strong love in her heart for those whom she knew and esteemed was not marred by that over-weening fondness which is so often a dangerous source of weakness. Her large heartedness, and the generosity which her position enabled her to exercise, was accompanied by shrewdness and a keenness of perception which kept her from being often imposed upon. To a large extent she followed the principle of the old Patriarch who said : " The cause which I knew not I searched out."

Her habitual unselfishness was one of her most marked characteristics, and nowhere was this more beautifully shown than in her own home. With all her round of varied duties, she always contrived to have a little leisure for whomsoever claimed her attention. She valued her many friends of high and low degree, and took a genuine delight in their concerns. Those who enjoyed her hospitalities in Liverpool, or Orchill, or London, must have noted how much she thought of her guests, and how little of herself. With large companies under her roof, she gave herself with kindly wisdom and unfailing tact to planning and arranging for their comfort, fitting and adapting the engagements and amusements of each so as to maintain the harmony and promote the happiness of all whom she and her husband delighted to receive.

Our dear friend had a brave heart. For years, unknown to any but herself, she must have suffered from the disease which has ultimately taken her from among us, but her brightness of spirit concealed it even from those who were most frequently with her. During her prolonged illness there was no approach to repining, no murmur ever fell from her lips, but with quietness and resignation she passed peacefully to the end of her earthly career.

It would be an impertinent intrusion were I to allude to the chief among the mourners here to-day, further than to say that she was his true helpmate all through their long married life. Her sound judgment, her wise counsel, her unfailing interest and sympathy and her loyal support of all the good work in which he has long taken an active interest, were of no small value to him in the important sphere he is called to occupy ; whilst attending to a thousand things that she might save him, towards him her attitude was ever that of one who had nothing to attend to but himself. Deeply do we sympathize with him in the loss he has sustained, and it will be no small consolation to know that vast numbers tenderly mourn with him and his at this trying time.

The qualities I have thus imperfectly sketched, all rooted down into and sprang from her true love to the Lord Jesus Christ as a personal Saviour. She knew and believed that " The Blood of Jesus Christ," God's Son, her Saviour, " cleanseth us from all sin." There

was always with her a certain reticence in speaking of her own experience, but frequently, and especially of late, there has come from her the calm, clear, confident expression of her sole hope being in her Saviour, who died for her and rose again. We part to-day from all that is mortal of our beloved friend, assured of her eternal well being, and in no mere formal use of words do we "commit her body to the ground, in the sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life through our Lord Jesus Christ." I do not wish you to think that I paint a perfect character. Nothing would be less in harmony with the feelings of the departed; neither do I indulge in a mere eulogy of the dead, but I know these things to be true, as do many of those around me, having had the privilege of friendship with Mrs. Smith for about thirty years.

Dr. Johnstone and Dr. Lundie also took part, and large numbers of the poor whom she had succoured stood round her grave. A band of children from Mrs. Birt's sheltering Home sang that sweet hymn :—

> Peace, perfect peace, in this dark world of sin,
> The blood of Jesus whispers peace within.

Amid all the sorrow a deep feeling of peace was diffused among the mourners. I never was so conscious of the nearness and reality of the future life. I may say that at this time I was much impressed by the argument from the fifteenth chapter of the 1st Corinthians, the great Resurrection chapter, and it was a consolatory occupation to set down some reflections on that great argument, which grew into a booklet published by Elliot Stock, entitled *The Resurrection Glory*, and there I ventured to expound what I believe to be the true foundation of our hope of immortality, viz., union with our risen and glorified Redeemer. "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive, but every one in his own order, Christ the firstfruits, afterwards they that are Christ's at His coming."

I found at this time great comfort in reading "In Memoriam." It was my constant companion. It put in words the dim half-conscious communion we cherish with the departed. How many souls have felt with Tennyson :—

> This truth came home with bier and pall,
> I felt it when I sorrowed most :
> 'Tis better to have loved and lost
> Than never to have loved at all.

* * * * *

Yet in these ears till hearing dies,
One set slow bell will seem to toll
The passing of the sweetest soul
That ever looked with human eyes.

I hear it now, and o'er and o'er,
Eternal greetings to the dead:
And ave, ave, ave, said
Adieu, adieu, for evermore.

When we are called to pass through these deep waters it seems difficult to take up again the threads of common life. Yet it has to be done, and one of my dear wife's last words was that she hoped I would go on with my Parliamentary work. She was a great admirer of Mr. Gladstone, and it may interest her friends, who still survive, to read a letter she wrote to a dear friend, describing a visit the great statesman paid to us some years before. (See Appendix XII.)

I visited my sister at Bournemouth, my friend Edward White at Mill Hill, and spent two week-ends with my son at Oxford, meeting some fine young men of his acquaintance, and my dear friend, Dr. Fairbairn, of Mansfield College, whose friendship has been a true solace in time of trial. The season was the earliest I remember. We had great heat even in March. In April the country was covered with verdure, and by the beginning of May the hawthorn, laburnum and horse chestnuts were in full bloom.

The second reading debate on the Home Rule Bill was finished on April 21, after a fortnight of oratory, and was carried by 43 majority in a House of 656 members. It went into Committee on May 8, and then commenced a long period of confusion and uproar and scenes of violence, which almost turned the House of Commons into a bear garden. I spent the Whitsuntide recess at Orchill, feeling the desolation of the home where for the first time in all those years the companion of my life was absent. "Oh, for the touch of a vanished hand, and the sound of a voice that is still!" But the sympathy of dear friends did something to abate the desolation, and I came back resolved to seek relief in the performance of public duty.

CHAPTER XXXIV

Session of 1893—The "May Meetings" at Exeter Hall—A Hot Season—The "Free Fight" in the House of Commons—The Home Rule Bill—Death of W. P. Lockhart—Retirement of Mr. Gladstone

I FOUND much refreshment this year by frequently attending the anniversary meetings at Exeter Hall. Indeed, all the time I was in London I usually attended the principal "May meetings," and often found it acted as an anodyne to the strain on the nerves caused by the heated debates in Parliament. The change of atmosphere is so complete. You pass in a moment from a feverish arena of party strife and irritating personalities to a climate of Christian love and unselfish devotion. The effect upon me was sometimes magical. The high-strung nerves were soothed, the tension of brain relaxed, and a feeling of calm stole over the wearied mind. I often spent the "dinner-hour," as it was called, say from 7.30 or 8 up to 9 or 10 p.m., at the great missionary or other philanthropic meetings that go on for two months or so, almost without interruption. Nothing like these is seen elsewhere in the world. The vastness of the British Empire is demonstrated as impressively there as in Westminster itself. I avoided speaking in the large hall as much as possible, for I found it was beyond the compass of my voice; but I frequently took part in the lower hall, of which the capacity is moderate. Exeter Hall has but poor acoustics, is badly ventilated, suffers from draughts, and is hardly worthy of our metropolis.

Another point I may note this year was the extraordinary season. It was one of the dryest and hottest on record. Even in March we had a spell of heat, and in April it was scorching; in July 95° in the shade was marked in London. Vegetation was a month earlier than usual. By the beginning of May the hawthorn, the chestnut and laburnum were in full flower. Scarcely any rain fell for four months. The earth was parched up, and the hay crop

was an entire failure. Indeed, all the crops were very poor, and this tended to deepen the commercial depression which lay heavily on this country. The Session was mainly occupied by the Irish Home Rule Bill. It was opposed with the most bitter and persistent obstruction. The committee stage was prolonged so much that at last the Government carried through the House a time limit, fixing July 27 for the end of the debate, and requiring all the clauses then to be put from the Chair without discussion. That night was memorable in the proceedings of the House. A scene of violence occurred unequalled since Cromwell expelled "the Rump" of the Long Parliament. A tumult broke out on the Opposition benches along the gangway between the Ulster (Orange) members and some of the Irish Nationalists. Blows were interchanged and several of the English members joined in the fray, till there was a confused *mêlée* which lasted for several minutes. I happened to be in the gallery above, and could only observe a crowd of disorderly men pushing and hustling one another. The voice of the Chairman, Mr. Mellor, could scarcely be heard. Mr. Gladstone sat stupefied at what must have seemed to him a death-blow to Parliamentary decorum. At last it occurred to the Chairman to send for Speaker Peel, when a wonderful change took place. His majestic mien, his commanding voice and accent of authority, at once produced a calm. An explanation was tendered to him of the cause of this fraças, and he restored order to the assembly in an incredibly short time, like the "vir gravis" of Virgil:

> Ac veluti magno in populo cum saepe coorta est
> Seditio, saevitque animis ignobile volgus,
> Jamque faces et saxa volant (furor arma ministrat).
> Tum, pietate gravem ac meritis si forte virum quem
> Conspexere, silent, arrectisque auribus adstant;
> Ille regit dictis animos, et pectora mulcet.

The Bill was automatically put through its committee stages. The last fifteen clauses were passed without discussion. It was in one sense an abuse of the power of a majority: in another sense it was the refusal of the House of Commons to commit suicide; but it cannot be doubted that it added to the unpopularity which attached to the Home Rule policy. The Bill passed its final stage by a majority of thirty-four, but was promptly thrown out in the Lords by an immense majority. According to usual Constitutional precedent, Mr. Gladstone might have dissolved Parliament

and appealed to the electors, but he did not take this course. Probably he doubted the verdict of the country. There is no doubt that the prolonged debates brought out the almost insuperable difficulties of setting up a subordinate Parliament in Ireland, while retaining the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament. Two alternative difficulties had to be faced: either the Irish members (reduced to eighty under the scheme) were free to vote on all questions, or were restricted to Imperial questions. Mr. Gladstone had formerly held that it passed the wit of man to discriminate between Imperial and other questions, and when attempts were made to do it they all failed. The American Constitution provided a Supreme Court to settle any disputes that might arise between the rights of the separate States and the Central Government, but we had no such court in the United Kingdom, nor was it likely that Parliament would create one. It was too great a power to entrust to the Speaker or to any committee of Parliament. Further, it would produce the hopeless *impasse* that two different majorities might co-exist in Parliament at the same time, a British majority (probably Conservative) when dealing with British questions such as Disestablishment, Education, etc., and a majority of the whole House, including Irish members (probably Liberal), when dealing with Imperial questions; so that a government might be unseated one week and reinstated the next, causing a continual see-saw. I have seen no answer given to this difficulty, nor can I see any, unless we adopt the Federal system of the United States or Canada, with a central Government and Parliament, and subordinate local Parliaments for the various parts of the United Kingdom. Obviously the nation is not prepared for so drastic a remedy. The Bill passed, with full power to the Irish members while at St. Stephen's to vote on all questions, so that they had double powers as compared with Scotch, English and Welsh representatives, and this was brought out so strongly, and by none more than that stalwart Radical, Dr. Wallace, of Edinburgh, that the Home Rule feeling steadily declined from that time forward. It is now evident that if delegation of local powers is to be brought about (and I am strongly in favour of this, at least as regards administration), it must be by explicitly assigning specified powers to local bodies, perhaps unions of County Councils. By this process of devolution a great mass of work now thrown on Parliament or government departments may most advantageously be relegated to provincial councils.

My dear friend, W. P. Lockhart, died this autumn at Ballater, near Balmoral, where he had gone in poor health. He never really recovered from his first stroke. A man of immense muscular power and great frame, and apparently iron constitution, he was cut down at the age of fifty-eight by some obscure brain complaint, probably induced by a blow from a cricket ball in early youth. He had a great desire to see me, and I went to Ballater in August and spent two or three days with my best friend, but he was too feeble for much intercourse. His great frame showed no sign of emaciation, but the brain power was nearly gone. He died a few days after I left, and was buried in Toxteth Cemetery in the next grave to my wife's. For no man had I a deeper respect. He was a survival of the Scotch Covenanters or English Puritans, touched by the wider culture of the nineteenth century; but had he lived in the seventeenth he might have been a Cromwell or a Richard Cameron. I never knew a man who was better acquainted with the Bible, or had greater power as a preacher. For over thirty years he must have preached three or four times a week on the average, while conducting his business in the daytime. Yet he never showed signs of fatigue, but he may well have exhausted his reserve of strength unknown to himself. He played a part in the life of Liverpool quite unique. He took a keen interest in public affairs, and till Gladstone's Home Rule policy caused him to join the Liberal Unionists he was a strong Radical. It was very much owing to his advice that I was induced to enter Parliament, and it was equally so with my friend, W. S. Caine, who was also deeply attached to Lockhart.[1] Shortly before this there also passed away another of my old friends, John Patterson, very similar in character to Lockhart; and soon after my dear friend and companion in many travels, the Rev. Dr. Lundie, one of the best citizens of Liverpool, and one of our best workers in temperance and social reform; also my venerable friend, Christopher Bushell. Such losses were irreparable. Were it not for the hope of immortality one could hardly endure them, but—

> Sin-blighted though we are, we, too,
> The reasoning sons of men,
> From one oblivious winter call'd,
> Shall rise and breathe again.
> And in eternal sunshine lose
> Our three score years and ten;

[1] See Appendix (XIII.) for an estimate I gave of Mr. Lockhart's life and character, included in his biography.

I paired at the beginning of September and went down to Orchill, but Parliament sat till far into the month, and was adjourned to an autumn session—more truly a winter session—in order to pass the Parish Councils Bill, introduced and ably carried by Sir Henry Fowler. I returned to Liverpool for the second half of October with Gordon. We found it oppressively sad. The blank at the fireside was ever before us. My son now went into business, giving up Oxford, and made up his mind to a commercial career. So for several Sessions I did not take a house in London, but went back and forward to Liverpool, spending the week-ends there.

The House met on November 2, and we had a long and dreary winter session, lasting into February, and only rising for a few days at Christmas, and then for some weeks in January and February, when a reconstruction of the Ministry took place by Mr. Gladstone's retirement. At last even his powerful frame showed signs of decay. His sight and hearing began to fail, and he decided to resign, and Lord Rosebery took his place as Prime Minister. A meeting of the Party was held at the Foreign Office, where Lord Rosebery addressed us, and was followed by Sir Wm. Harcourt, who took the place of Leader in the House of Commons. I should mention that much friction occurred between the Lords and Commons in regard to the Parish Councils Bill. It was mutilated by the Upper House, so that the Government declined to pass it, and several conferences took place before the Lords withdrew or modified their amendments. It was the last public work of Mr. Gladstone. His last speech (on March 1) was an appeal to the Upper Chamber, couched in tones of grave warning. His retirement came so suddenly that no opportunity was given to say farewell to that House which he had adorned for sixty years. Many of us regretted this. It would have been a great historical occasion. He was then eighty-four. No Premier had ever held office before at such an age!

This winter was marked by great depression of trade, and by much sickness and influenza. Several of my friends were ill, and Gordon's companion was taken very ill at Edinburgh. We went for a short run to Cannes when the House was not sitting. The old Session closed on March 5: the new one opened on March 12.

CHAPTER XXXV

Session of 1894 — Keswick Conference — Drummond's "Ascent of Man"

THE Government of Lord Rosebery had a troubled time. It was in office rather than in power. In several divisions it had so narrow a majority in the Commons that its life was precarious. The Upper House hampered it in every possible way. The Liberal Party there had fallen to an insignificant minority. Sir William Harcourt's great Budget was the chief event of the Session. He carried through with wonderful skill and pertinacity a vast change in the death duties, based upon the principal of graduation of duty according to the amount of the estate, which added several millions to the revenue of the country; and he also practically equalized taxation upon real and personal property, which had hitherto been unduly favourable to land. It was his principal achievement, and it has greatly aided future financial arrangements when the strain of war came on the nation. This long, complicated and hard-fought bill was carried through without—so far as I remember—the Closure being once applied. Mr. Asquith also introduced this Session the Welsh Disestablishment Bill in a very able speech.

The only Parliamentary work of importance I accomplished this Session was to move a resolution on the Indian Budget, which was accepted in part by Sir Henry Fowler, the Secretary for India. It read as follows :—

> That, in the opinion of this House, a full and independent Parliamentary inquiry should take place into the condition and wants of the Indian people, and their ability to bear their existing financial burdens; the nature of the Revenue system and the possibility of reductions in the expenditure; also the financial relations between India and the United Kingdom, and generally the system of Government in India.

I spoke at some length and was seconded by Dadabhai Naoroji,

the sole native of India who then sat in Parliament. He spoke for two hours. The debate went on into next day, and at the close Sir Henry Fowler agreed to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the apportionment of charges between the British and Indian Exchequers. After sitting for some years it reported in favour of taking over about £250,000 a year from India, and placing it on the British Exchequer, which has since been done. But the inquiry did not embrace the far more important question of the poverty of India and the need of reduced taxation. This is a question of enormous and urgent importance, and will come to the front some day. Let us hope that we shall not wait till some catastrophe force it upon us, as South Africa has been forced upon our attention by a terrible war.

Among interesting events that happened this year out of Parliament I may mention that I witnessed the Jubilee of General Booth at the Crystal Palace. A great body of the Salvation Army were present. Some 80,000 people were in the grounds—not all Salvationists, but the serried ranks that marched before the "General" seemed like the regiments of a great army. From many parts of the world representatives of "the Army" were present. It was enough to turn the head of any ordinary mortal, but the old "General" and his gifted family can carry the honour meekly. One may doubt, however, whether a succession of leaders will be equally sagacious, and whether this great force may not at some time be used by an ambitious governor for self-aggrandizement.

I also attended for the first time this year the "Keswick Convention," in July. A first visit to this wonderful gathering is always deeply interesting. One sees there a population of intensely earnest men and women, overflowing the town of Keswick and its beautiful surroundings, some thousands in number, and occupied exclusively with "things pertaining to the Kingdom of God." Two huge tents and several smaller ones were filled from morning to evening with a succession of eager assemblies who followed the addresses with rapt attention. The speakers were of all Protestant denominations. Church and dissent embrace one another: Quakers, Baptists and Plymouth Brethren mingle with Churchmen, Presbyterians and Methodists. No one can discern in the language of the platform any flavour of sect or party. The substantial unity of all true Christians is demonstrated most impressively. It is also shown what a deep and all-embracing religion is that of Jesus

Christ, how it dominates the whole life, and meets every spiritual want of man. No one can attend these conferences, if in the right spirit, without being the better of it, and only carping criticism will fasten on little excrescences to depreciate them. The fact is they cut too deeply into merely conventional religion to please those who try "to serve both God and mammon"; but for those who wish to realize what Christianity is in its pristine power as it issued from the hand of its Author, they are stimulating in the highest degree. There is an added charm in the exquisite scenery of Keswick, perhaps the fairest spot in our island. I was usually fortunate in weather, but it does rain there at times, and a deluge is not conducive to comfort in the tents!

About this time a book was published which made a great stir in the religious world—Drummond's *Ascent of Man*. Professor Henry Drummond had made a great name by his first book, *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*. It was based upon a full belief in supernatural religion and the Christian revelation as accredited by miracle. Its science was not of the highest, but it was very suggestive and was delightful reading. He had been for a number of years an accepted religious teacher of evangelical views and of great beauty of life. His influence on young men was quite extraordinary, and it was a sad surprise when his last book almost joined hands with Huxley and Tyndall, and rejected the Bible account of the special creation of man, and accepted evolution over countless millenniums as the sole efficient cause of the Universe and all that it contains. Let it be said that at that time the scientific world was intoxicated with the evolution theory. It was supposed to be capable of explaining everything. "Great is Diana of the Ephesians!" It was the fashion to sit down and worship "the image which fell down from Jupiter!" I think this worship has considerably subsided of late years. Sober thinkers are less persuaded that man can explore the infinite wisdom of God, and many of our best scientists are returning to the devout mood of Sir Isaac Newton, who spoke of himself as "a child gathering pebbles on the shore of the ocean of truth." I ventured in a short pamphlet to challenge the methods of Drummond's book, and quote from it the following passages:—

Professor Drummond claims to give a history of man from the side of science; and to answer the question, Whence and how came he to be here? He sees no evidence of direct creation by God; but holds that man, like everything else in the universe, is the product of gradual

development through countless ages. Go far enough back to the rudimentary forms of animal life, and the progenitor of man is discovered among the "ascidians" or "molluscs." From this initial stage an ascending series of animal forms is evolved, ending in the "mammalia"; and out of this latest order

SOME APE-LIKE ANIMAL

is the ancestor of the savage; and after countless years the savage is developed into the civilized man. Every stage of this process is the work of a Power which is sometimes called "Nature" and sometimes "Evolution"; its tendency is to develop ever higher and higher forms of life. Man, according to this theory, must be always progressing towards a higher goal; though the book is silent as to whether another stage of life awaits him beyond the grave. This is a very brief abstract of a many-sided argument, which it is impossible to epitomize with absolute accuracy; but it represents, I hope with fairness, the general scope of the book.

Now, the first thing that strikes a Christian believer is the complete contradiction between the scheme of life here set forth and the teaching of Holy Scripture. According to it, man is the direct creation of God: "God created man in His own image; in the image of God created He him: male and female created He them" (Gen. i. 27). He falls from his state of innocency, and Sin and Death enter the world; and the whole scheme of Christian doctrine is reared on this foundation. It is not, as some assume it to be, merely the primitive traditions of an unhistorical age; but it is the basis of the teaching of Christ and His apostles: "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned" (Rom. v. 12). Our blessed Lord Himself, in expounding the marriage laws, said: "From the beginning of the creation God made them male and female; for this cause shall a man leave his father and mother and cleave to his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh" (Mark x. 6–8). The whole scheme of Redemption is founded on the fact that man is a fallen and dying creature, but capable of being restored to that image of God from which he fell. "Since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive" (1 Cor. xv. 21, 22). Nothing is more striking in Scripture than the absolute distinction drawn between man and the lower animals: man alone is under law to God; man alone is a sinner, and needs a Saviour; man alone is worthy of being redeemed from death and hell, and of enjoying "everlasting life." The Bible has been well said "to breathe the atmosphere of eternity," and man alone is able to inhale that atmosphere; he is the only creature capable of "looking before and after." An impassable gulf separates him from the wisest elephant, or ape, or dog; none of these can be made to "know God"; none of them has a soul in the spiritual sense of the term; of no other creature can it be said, "What shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?"

* * * * * *

According to this writer Christianity and Evolution are but two names for the same thing: "Up to this time no word has been spoken to reconcile Christianity with Evolution, or Evolution with Christianity. And why? Because the two are one. What is Evolution? A method of creation. What is its object? To make more perfect living beings. What is Christianity? A method of creation. What is its object? To make more perfect living beings. Through what does Evolution work? Through love. Evolution and Christianity have the same author, the same end, the same spirit."

Now, I admit that there is a kind of evolution contained in Christianity; but is it the Evolution of Professor Drummond? The Word of God plainly teaches that God has a plan and a purpose which takes ages for their fulfilment. The plan is expressed in these words:—"After that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe" (1 Cor. i. 21); "for the preaching of the Cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us who are saved it is the power of God" (1 Cor. i. 18). That is

GOD'S "PLAN OF SALVATION."

His purpose is expressed in the following words:—"That in the dispensation of the fulness of times He might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth, even in Him" (Eph. i. 10).

* * * * * *

Is man destined to be a citizen of earth or heaven? Shall "this corruptible put on incorruption, and this mortal put on immortality?" These are the questions that agitate the soul of man; compared with these it is a trifle by what steps he has been brought to this stage of his earthly journey. Professor Drummond's book is silent on this transcendent theme, unless the following enigmatical utterance, which closes the volume, be taken as an answer to it: "Evolution always attains, always rounds off its work. It spent an eternity over the earth, but finished it. It struggled for millenniums to bring the vegetable kingdom up to the flowering plants, and attained. In the animal kingdom it never paused until the possibilities of organization were exhausted in the mammalia. Kindled by this past, man may surely say, 'I shall arrive.' The succession cannot break. The further evolution must go on, the higher kingdom come—first the blade, where we are to-day; then the ear, where we shall be to-morrow; then the full corn in the ear, which awaits our children's children, and which we live to hasten."

Surely one may well ask with surprise, Is this all the light that Professor Drummond can cast on human destiny? Had Christ preached this doctrine, would multitudes of sinners have followed Him, listening to "the glad tidings of the Kingdom of God?" Would "the poor, the maimed, the halt, and the blind" have crowded round the Great Physician? And could He have truly said, "I am the light of the world; he that followeth Me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life" (John viii. 12)?

I should like now to examine, in the light of history as well as of Scripture, the main thesis of Professor Drummond's book, that Evolution is steadily carrying mankind and all things in the universe towards a higher goal; its keynote, he tells us, is "perfectness"; and lest I should misrepresent him, I quote two important passages (p. 435):—"For all things are rising, all worlds, all planets, all stars, all suns. An ascending energy is in the universe, and the whole moves on with one mighty idea and anticipation. The aspiration in the human mind and heart is but the evolutionary tendency of the universe becoming conscious." . . . "Evolution is less a doctrine than a light; it is a light revealing in the chaos of the past a perfect and growing order, giving meaning even to the confusions of the present, discovering through all the deviousness around us the paths of progress, and flashing its rays already upon a coming goal. Men begin to see an undeviating ethical purpose in this material world, a tide, that from eternity has never turned, making for perfectness."

This is a very lovely picture: how far is it true?

We have a tolerably accurate record of human history for about 3,000 years. We know something of the rise and fall of the Assyrian and Chaldean Empires; of the Egypt of the Pharaohs; of ancient China and India; and, coming to later periods, we have accurate and reliable history of ancient Greece and Rome. Do we see in this long stretch of human history the constant ascending process? I think not. We see a succession of advances followed by reactions; we see successive civilizations swept away by waves of barbarism; we see nothing permanent, and no solid basis for progress, except so far as real living faith in God has purified national life. Ancient Egypt, ancient Assyria, ancient Chaldea fell because they became corrupt. The ruins of Nineveh, Babylon, and Thebes tell of a higher civilization 3,000 years ago than now exists there. The China of Confucius, the Persia of Zoroaster, the India of Sakya-Muni, had a higher life than they possess today. No one doubts that the Greece of Aeschylus and Sophocles, of Marathon and Plataea was better than that corrupt and decayed nationality which fell an easy prey to the Romans. The Sophists, who disputed with Paul on Mars Hill, were pigmies compared with Plato and Socrates. In the same way the Rome of Cato and the Scipios was a purer and a nobler state than the Rome of Nero and Tiberius. Never did humanity sink lower than in the times of the twelve Caesars, when Rome was undisputed mistress of the world. The worst pessimists are Tacitus and Juvenal, who are but echoes of the first chapter of Romans.

Is not the ethical history of ancient civilization epitomized in these words: "Even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient" (Rom. i. 28)? Is the root principle of modern civilization in any wise different? I think not. It contains no principle of perpetuity apart from living faith in a holy God: when this declines all that is good declines as well. The Paris of Robespierre, the France of Zola, have the seeds of decay as surely implanted as the Rome of

Caligula or the Babylon of Nebuchadnezzar. If the wave of atheism and sensuality that is sweeping over France is not checked it will as surely extinguish French civilization as it did that of ancient Rome.

All over Europe we see the same conflict waged—the forces of evil were never stronger than at the close of this nineteenth century. All the great cities of Europe and America present the spectacle of vast numbers of people as dead to God and the higher life as ever the heathen were. Whence this burst of Anarchism in modern times? Whence come the dynamiter and the assassin—such conspicuous figures of late years? Whence this desperate social bitterness which eventuated the other day in a kind of civil war in Chicago? It came from the decline of religious faith and its inevitable consequence—lawlessness.

Does the present outlook of humanity justify the optimism of Professor Drummond? Might not just as good an argument be made in favour of the pessimistic theory? Are the British people, that most favoured race, getting better and better? Examine the literature they read to-day; is it purer or more elevating than in the times of the Puritans? Is it even as good as in the days of Sir Walter Scott, of Dickens and Thackeray? Is not the special note of this time the immense increase of unclean books and periodicals, the steady drift towards the bestial literature of modern France? Nothing but the stricter enforcement of the law against obscene publications keeps this country from sinking to the same level. Just as the reading of a nation deteriorates, so do its morals; and the London of to-day presents too many traces of the same moral decay which undermined the nations of antiquity. The fearful convulsions in the United States have drawn attention to its moral condition. I quote a true description of American civilization from one of their religious periodicals, which recently was reproduced in *The Christian* :—

"It is strange that good and sensible men can look upon the state of things existing in our own country without alarm. Here is a land hid from the nations of Europe until the Art of Printing and the Reformation. God sent to it the Puritans and the Huguenots, the best seed of earth. He gave to them statesmen with wisdom to lay the foundations of the most beneficent government the world had ever seen. In climate, soil, extent of territory, wealth, increase of population, and all the elements of prosperity, it has never been equalled. Yet where are we to-day? Anarchy, lawlessness, crime and violence threaten our national existence. . . . The utter weakness of Congress to cope with the financial difficulties that oppress the people; the rapid increase of murders, suicides, and divorces; the wide separation between the Church and those known as labourers; the condition of the Church itself, honeycombed with infidelity and decaying with worldliness—all betoken that we are on the eve of a disastrous and destructive change, and that the conversion of this part of the world at least is the wildest dream."

To this I will only add that six thousand murders were committed in the United States during the year 1893; and lynch law reigns supreme in a large part of its territory. I ask, do the signs of the times

justify the optimism of Professor Drummond, or the darker outlook of the New Testament ?

I also added a brief synopsis of the opinions of leading scientists on the late origin of man and the entire absence of any geological evidence of his descent from the brutes :—

Sir Chas. Lyell, in *Principles of Geology*, says :—

" Man must be regarded by the geologist as a creature of yesterday."

Professor Huxley, in *American Addresses*, says :—

" I cannot at present find any intermediate forms which bridge over those gaps or intervals. . . . We know of no animal now living which in any sense is intermediate."

In his *Lay Sermons*, 1870 (p. 249), Huxley remarked :—

" What, then, does an impartial survey of the positively ascertained truths of Palaeontology testify in relation to the common doctrine of progressive modification ? . . . It negatives those doctrines ; for it either shows us no evidence of any such modification, or demonstrates it to have been very slight."

Professor Dana, the eminent geologist, in *Geology*, says :—

" No remains of fossil man bear evidence to less perfect erectness of structure than in civilized man, or to any nearer approach to the man-apes in essential characteristics. . . . Not the first link below the lowest level of existing man has yet been found. . . . If the links ever existed, their annihilation, without trace, is so extremely improbable that it may be pronounced impossible. Until some are found, Science can never assert they ever existed."

Professor Virchow, in *Freedom of Science*, says :—

" On the whole, we must really acknowledge that there is a complete absence of any fossil type of a lower stage in the development of man. Nay, if we gather together the whole sum of the fossil men hitherto known, and put them on a parallel with those of the present time, we can decidedly pronounce that there are among living men a much greater number of individuals who show a relatively inferior type than there are among fossils known up to this time."

Lord Salisbury, in his recent address to the British Association, says :—

" The cloud of impenetrable mystery hangs over the development and still more over the origin of life. If we strain our eyes to pierce it, with the foregone conclusion that some solution is and must be attainable, we shall only mistake for discoveries the figments of our own imagination."

He closes his address with these remarkable words :—

" I prefer to shelter myself in this matter behind the judgment of the greatest living master of natural science among us, Lord Kelvin, and to quote as my own concluding words the striking language with which he closed his address from this chair more than twenty years ago. ' I have always felt,' he said, ' that the hypothesis of natural selection does not contain the true theory of Evolution, if Evolution there has

been in biology. : : : I feel profoundly convinced that the argument of design has been greatly too much lost sight of in recent zoological speculations. Overpoweringly strong proofs of intelligent and benevolent design lie around us, and if ever perplexities, whether metaphysical or scientific, turn us away from them for a time, they come back upon us with irresistible force, showing to us through nature the influence of a free will, and teaching us that all living things depend on one everlasting Creator and Ruler.' "

I think, therefore, I am justified in stating that the whole Evolution theory rests upon conjecture, and nothing but conjecture ; the transmutation of species even in the animal and vegetable kingdom is confined within narrow limits. As Professor Drummond stated in his first book, *Natural Law in the Spiritual World* : " impassable barriers mark off the provinces of Nature, as the organic and the inorganic are staked off from each other by a boundary which cannot be crossed " ; so, according to the Professor, at that time " the spiritual man " was separated by an impassable gulf from " the natural man." His language was then most emphatic. " The passage from the natural world to the spiritual world is hermetically sealed on the natural side. The door from the inorganic to the organic is shut. No mineral can open it ; so the door from the natural to the supernatural is shut, and no man can open it " (p. 71). " There is no spontaneous generation in religion any more than in nature. Christ is the source of life in the spiritual world ; and he that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son, whatever else he may have, hath not life " (p. 74). " No exposition of the case could be more truly scientific than this, ' the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God ; for they are foolishness unto him : *neither can He know them*, because they are spiritually discerned;"

CHAPTER XXXVI

Church Questions and Disestablishment—Depression of Trade

I MUST now mention that another great subject, or rather a group of questions connected with it, was forcing itself upon me, and became the chief work of my life, both in and out of Parliament. My connexion with Wales had drawn me to study the plea for Disestablishment as affecting the Principality, but I felt that the principles involved were far deeper than those of race or language. The question was too exclusively argued in Wales as one of Celtic history and tradition. This argument had little weight with the Anglicans, who claimed divine rights for their church, and who conceived that the State was bound by the law of God to foster and uphold one apostolic form of Christianity. Two converging currents met together which united in condemnation of dissent—the Erastian theory, which placed religion under State patronage and control, and the High Church theory, which made schism a deadly sin. These theories, opposed and even contradictory at many points, coalesced when any attack was made on the venerable fabric of Church establishment. I had all my life been a free Churchman, believing that the New Testament gave no ground for State establishments of religion, but strongly asserted the spiritual independence of the Church. Our Lord's words seemed decisive, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's." Yet looking to the quiescent state of the English mind and its rooted conservatism, I saw little use in agitating this question while so many urgent questions had to be settled. The subject of Disestablishment had greatly declined since the days of Mr. Miall. The Liberation Society had become political rather than religious. It somewhat repelled the more religious section of the community, and the question had been so moribund that for thirty years it had not been raised in Parliament.

But another force had now entered the field which was carrying all before it, and powerfully reacted on the old theory of Church and State. The High Church movement in its earlier days was the work of a small number of devoted men, led by Newman, Pusey and Keble, possessed by mediaeval piety of a type hardly distinguishable from that of Roman monks of the best type. When Newman, Manning and several of the leaders went over to Rome there was a temporary panic. The movement was strenuously condemned. The bishops were all against it, and for several years it was thought it had received its death blow. The great mass of the English laity treated it with disdain. Its affectation of Romish vestments was characterized as "man millinery": its elaborate sacramental ceremonial as "the Mass in masquerade." During Lord Palmerston's long régime the bishops, under Lord Shaftesbury's influence, were all selected from the Evangelical section, and Earl Russell and Disraeli followed on these lines. But Mr. Gladstone—the first High Church Premier—took the opposite line. During his long tenure of power he gave preferment mainly to men of his own sacerdotal views, and he was followed by Lord Salisbury in the same direction. The result was that, almost unknown to the public, the centre of gravity shifted from the Low to the High Church section of the Church. It came to be taken for granted that the interference of the State with doctrine and ritual was abandoned. The practical failure of the Public Worship Regulation Act of Disraeli, passed in 1874, gave impunity to the Ritualistic Party.

During the eighties, and still more in the nineties, the spread of high ritualism was phenomenal. The *High Churchman's Tourist Guide* showed that the churches into which the "six points" of sacerdotalism were introduced, increased by leaps and bounds,[1] and the laity of England, who had looked on in a semi-amused frame of mind at these vestments and postures, found out when too late that the doctrines of the Reformation had been replaced

[1] The following were the figures given by the *Guide* in 1898, showing the increase of so-called Catholic usages since 1882 :—

Churches.	1882.	1898.
Daily Holy Eucharist	123	613
Eucharistic Vestments (special symbols of a Mass priest)	336	2,026
Incense	9	381
Altar Lights at the Holy Eucharist	581	4,334
Mixed Chalice	——	4,030
Eastward position	1,662	7,044

by a Catholic revival which was sometimes hardly distinguishable from that of Rome.

Great societies were formed among the clergy: some, like the English Church Union, led by Lord Halifax, openly seeking union with Rome; others of a secret or semi-secret order, like the "League of the Holy Cross," or the "Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament," pledging themselves to reintroduce practically all the doctrines and practices that existed before the Reformation—the Mass, the Confessional, the Adoration of the Virgin Mary, the Invocation of Saints, the teaching of Purgatory, the power of the priest to give or refuse absolution, the doctrine of penance, the practice of monasticism and celibacy—the Seven Sacraments. All the characteristic marks of the old Romish system which were swept away at the Reformation were revived in thousands of parishes.

When the Churchwardens, on behalf of the congregations, appealed to the Bishops they were snubbed and told to mind their business. When prosecutions were instituted, the Bishop's veto was interposed to frustrate them. Notwithstanding that the Church Association (the Low Church Society) had at immense expense (£80,000) succeeded in getting a condemnation of nearly all these practices from the highest ecclesiastical tribunal (the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council), the law was set at defiance, and a state of things arose which can only be called sheer anarchy. I have described this movement rather from the Protestant and legal side than from the spiritual. I well know that in its origin it was an attempt of men deeply in earnest to restore religion to a higher level on sacerdotal lines. It was a sincere attempt to revive belief in salvation by priests and sacraments, which was the doctrine of the Middle Ages, and which was overthrown by the Reformation, which followed the New Testament in placing the stress on faith in Christ and obedience to Him. While not rejecting the latter the High Church Ritualists grafted on it a system which placed them almost in the background. They showed what all Church history has proved to be true: that you cannot mix systems so opposite as Judaism and Christianity—I mean Judaism as far as the office of the priest is concerned. The religion taught by Christ and His apostles knows nothing of a sacrificing priesthood, or of any priest at all except our "Great High Priest," who has passed into the heavens and who "once in the end of the world appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself."

It is quite impossible to build up a system in which the sacrificing priest plays the leading part without pulling down the fabric of evangelical belief. It may be truly said that the religion of the English laity, alike inside and outside the National Church, was nearly all Protestant and Evangelical up to the middle of the nineteenth century. The High Church revival has indubitably attracted a considerable number of earnest women, and a limited number of earnest men, but even yet it only touches the fringe of the population. The perilous condition is that the clergy and laity think increasingly on separate planes, and so the Church is losing its hold on the intelligence of the great mass of the nation.

These great doctrinal changes steal on so silently that it is not easy to mark off their stages, but I think it will be allowed that in the eighties, and still more in the nineties, the sense of a great national danger spread through the religious community. Conversions to Rome became a marked feature. The activity of the Jesuits in England, and even in Scotland, was redoubled. Several cases came to my knowledge of scions of leading and noble families captured by means which I can only call fraudulent, such as tutors introduced as Protestants while Jesuits in disguise. Some great fortunes and hereditary titles have thereby passed from the Anglican to the Roman communion. Girls' schools were specially used for this kind of propagandism, and it is beyond doubt that in many of them habitual confession to a priest was insisted on by Anglican sisterhoods. In not a few cases these girls in after life found their way into Romish convents. Special schools for boys were also started, in which the Confessional was practised, and several of the theological colleges of the Anglican Church became almost seminaries for teaching Roman doctrine. The current of Anglican sacerdotalism mingled with the current that set towards Rome. They were one at bottom. They sprang from the same source, and they moved in the same direction.

For a long time I felt unwilling to plunge into a conflict with an earnest section of the Anglican Church. For most of my life I had been combating evils on which all good men could unite, but now it seemed cowardly to keep silence in presence of this great danger. I was deeply convinced that the decline of England would set in with the reign of priestcraft: that if the Reformation were undone in the National Church it was not worth preserving its national character. The last portion of my public life was mainly occupied with these questions. I gave an address to my

constituents towards the end of this year (1894), in which I went fully into the question of Church and State as connected with the Romanizing movement. I venture to reproduce a portion of it here as expressing the matured opinions of a lifetime. I fully believe that the twentieth century will not advance far till it becomes the burning question of the day. Whenever a great statesman arises in England who has strong Protestant convictions, and who places before the nation the alternative of either purging the Church of Romanizing practices, or placing it in the position of the free self-governing Church of Ireland, the nation will rally to his support. If the laity of the National Church were allowed to elect their clergy as in Ireland, and to share with the clergy in the choice of the bishops, and in exercising discipline in cases of clerical contumacy, the Romish leaven would gradually be purged out. To this we must come at length.

My address was extempore, but I quote from a verbatim report published in pamphlet form and slightly revised :—

In our political meetings in Wales we have usually to deal with the Disestablishment question upon political and national grounds—those are most suited for ordinary public meetings at which are to be found persons of all opinions on religious questions. But there are much deeper grounds, on which we who belong to the Free Churches disbelieve in the principle of State Establishments. There are scriptural and spiritual grounds which deeply appeal to all religious men, and which form the foundation upon which this great question must eventually be settled. I regret that the exigencies of politics confine us so much to the merely political side of the question. We all know there are in this country multitudes of good men in the Established Church who believe that divine revelation has laid down as a fundamental principle the doctrine of establishment. There are also multitudes of good men among the Nonconformist bodies who are fully persuaded that no such principle whatever has been laid down by God. The battle will eventually be decided by convincing the Christian people of this country on which side the truth lies. It is more a religious than a political question.

I think on this occasion it may be appropriate for me to say a few words on this question which agitates the whole of Wales, and which occupies the minds of the people far more than any other question. I believe I am expressing the feeling of all the Nonconformists of Great Britain, and a great many Churchmen as well, when I say that I strongly believe that State Establishments have always been injurious to spiritual religion. I believe those who know most of church history will most readily accept this view. All who have studied church history know that by far the most active and spiritual time of Christianity was during the first three centuries, when it was a persecuted religion. They also know that from the time the Christian Church was established by the

Emperor Constantine as a state institution its spirituality declined, and that the cause of religion suffered in place of being benefited by the alliance between church and state.

From that time onward prelates and dignitaries of the Christian Church became increasingly proud, worldly and avaricious. They usurped more and more the prerogatives that belong to civil government, and they drifted further and further away from the pure spiritual lines on which the Christian Church was originally established. No one with any competent knowledge of church history will deny that the middle ages of Europe were the darkest times of Christianity, and this darkness deepened on to the period prior to the Reformation. I suppose that at no period was Christianity so corrupt as in the fifteenth and the early part of the sixteenth century; at the time when Alexander Borgia and Leo X. were Popes; when Rome was almost as debased as in the worst days of Paganism; at a time when indulgences were being sold, not only for the pardon of past sins, but the pardon of future sins, in order that money might be raised to build the magnificent dome of St. Peter. The union between church and state brought the Christian Church of Europe to what we are now in the habit of calling the dark ages.

Then we had the great revival of the Reformation. We undoubtedly then had in many parts of Europe a restoration of spiritual Christianity, with a strong tendency to return to apostolic lines; but, unfortunately, the reformed churches for the most part clung to the idea of an alliance with the state. This was peculiarly the case in England, and perhaps in England more than any other country. The reason of this was that the Reformation in England was not so much a spiritual movement springing from the masses of the people as a political movement, or a semi-religious movement, arising from the action of the sovereign. Every one knows that the first breach with the Papacy in England arose from a quarrel between Henry VIII. and the Pope on the question of divorce, and all through the times of Henry and Elizabeth the Reformation was carried on by these sovereigns with the main object of preserving for the crown those rights which formerly belonged to the Pope. Their great aim was to place the sovereign of this realm as far as could be in the place of the Pope; consequently the Reformation in England was only half done. It was far inferior in its thoroughness to the Reformation in Scotland, Switzerland, Holland, and in other parts of Europe. I wish to point this out, because it has a most close connexion with the controversy which we are waging to-day.

The Reformation in England had for its corner-stone the acknowledgement of the royal supremacy over the church. Now we hold as Nonconformists that the teaching of Christ is perfectly clear and distinct on this subject. He gives no hint, nor lays down any doctrine, which justifies a State Establishment. You may search the New Testament from beginning to end, and you will not find a hint of this doctrine of the alliance of church and state; but we have very strong evidence to the contrary. The Lord said, "My kingdom is not of this world."[21] He said further, "Render unto Caesar the things that are

Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's." In so doing He laid down a clear distinction between the duties we owe to the civil magistrate and the duties we owe to God. He showed that there are two distinct spheres—the sphere of religion, in which we are directly responsible to God alone, and the sphere of secular duty and secular rights, in which we are responsible to the lawful government of the day.

Now we contend that the system of Church Establishment has tended to confuse these spheres, and if you talk to many Churchmen who have never examined this subject, you will find that they do not appreciate the line of demarcation that exists between civil duty and religious duty. They are blended together in a kind of chaos, and it is most important, in view of the great controversy with which the nation is now faced, that we should seek to understand at the very highest source what the Divine intention was. I hold that the New Testament teaches us that the design of God was to build up a spiritual kingdom apart from the secular kingdoms of this world ; a kingdom governed by its own laws, a kingdom responsible to Christ as the head of the church, and that the kingdoms of this world should not invade the prerogatives of the kingdom of Christ. Those who uphold the system of a State Church cannot find the scantiest evidence in the teachings of Christ or His apostles for their views. Our opponents, however, go back to the Old Testament for support, and seem to think that because the Jewish Church was interwoven with the state—was indeed almost identical with it—that therefore the principle is laid down that there must be a union between the church and state.

I am here to state the universal conviction not only of Nonconformists but of many learned Churchmen, that no argument can be drawn from the Jewish Church in favour of an established Christian Church.

The Jewish Church was a Theocracy ; the Government of the nation was a Theocracy. The Jewish Church stood upon the same footing exactly as the sacrifices, as the ordinance of circumcision, and of tithes. They were part of the law of the nation, and all came to an end with the advent of Christ. The epistle to the Hebrews was mainly written to show that the old Mosaic system had come to an end, and we have no more a right to teach that the establishment of the Jewish Church is imposed upon Christians, than we have to hold that the Passover and the ordinance of circumcision are imposed upon Christians. They all stand or fall together ; they are parts of the same system.

Our blessed Lord launched the Christian Church upon a new basis : the basis of voluntary effort and voluntary support. All experience proves that just in proportion as the church has been separated from state control and alliance in that proportion has it been pure and fruitful. Now I said a little while ago that in England the Reformation was only, so to speak, half done. The fundamental and cardinal error committed was the imposition upon the reformed church of a royal supremacy in lieu of the supremacy of the Pope.

I will now make a statement which will perhaps interest this meeting. I came to be acquainted quite recently with the form of oath which

every Bishop has to make to the Sovereign on being invested with his bishopric. It is what is called the oath of homage. To show how strongly this doctrine of royal supremacy is still held, I will read a letter which Earl Russell wrote in 1875, giving the form of oath to be taken by every bishop :—

"I, ———, Doctor of Divinity, now elected, confirmed, and consecrated Bishop of ———, do hereby declare that your Majesty is the only Supreme Governor of this your realm in spiritual and ecclesiastical things, as well as in temporal, and that no foreign prelate or potentate has any jurisdiction within this realm ; and I acknowledge that I hold the said Bishopric, as well the spiritualities as the temporalities thereof, only of your Majesty. And for the same temporalities I do my homage, presently to your Majesty. So help me God."

So you see this is not a case of ancient history. It is a doctrine which is held in full force at the present day. I am not aware that any change has been made since 1875. Along with the doctrine of royal supremacy has come in a crop of what I must call rank abuses in the constitution of our national church. I am most unwilling to say anything to hurt the feelings of sincere Churchmen, but many Churchmen are not aware of these facts, and in this great crisis in the history of religion I think that they should know these things, for which the union between church and state is responsible. As I said before, the constitution of the church involves many flagrant abuses, but I think the most flagrant of all is the appointment of the chief officers of the church by the Prime Minister of the day. The bishops are the chief officers of the Church of England, and the appointment of bishops has long rested in the hands of the Prime Minister. According to our constitution any man may reach the position of Prime Minister whatever his religion or whether he has any religion or not. There is nothing in our constitution to prevent a Freethinker becoming Prime Minister. If such a thing happened the most solemn duty of selecting the rulers of Christ's Church would rest with him. Some of our past Prime Ministers were notoriously irreligious men. Yet they had the appointment of the chief officers of this Christian Church. It is not so very long since these appointments were made very largely for political purposes. During the eighteenth century it was the custom to make these sacred appointments mainly on grounds of political expediency, and it is notorious that several of the bishops appointed in England and Wales, even until the beginning of the nineteenth century, were utterly unfitted for their sacred office. Some may think that this is all ancient history, and that now everything has been reformed and changed. But to show how mistaken that view is, I will just quote a few sentences from a book which has had a large circulation—I refer to the *Life of Bishop Wilberforce*. Here is a quotation from the diary of Bishop Wilberforce, dated 1868, and perhaps our successors fifty years hence will read quotations from the diaries of bishops of the present day very similar to it :—

"*Nov.* 28.—Much talk with the Dean of Windsor. He talked with great reserve about the late appointments, but said, 'The Church does

not know what it owes to the Queen. Disraeli has been utterly ignorant, utterly unprincipled; he rode the Protestant horse one day, then got frightened that it had gone too far, and was injuring the county elections, so he went right round and proposed names never heard of. Nothing he would not have done. . . . Disraeli recommended ——— for Canterbury, but the Queen would not have him; then Disraeli agreed, most reluctantly, and with passion to Tait. . . . Disraeli then proposed Wordsworth for London. The Queen objected strongly . . . then she suggested Jackson . . . and Disraeli chose Jackson. The Queen would have greatly liked ———, but Disraeli would not hear of him. You cannot conceive the appointments he proposed and retracted, or was overruled. . . . He had no other thought than the votes of the moment; he showed an ignorance about all church matters, men, opinions, that was astonishing, making propositions one way and the other, riding the Protestant horse to gain the boroughs, and then, when he thought he had gone so far as to endanger the counties, he turned round.' "

Now, I ask, can any Christian look upon this method of appointment to these sacred offices without a feeling akin to disgust. I ask sincere Churchmen, who are also believers in the Word of God, if they think that this is the way the Most High intended that the chief officers of the Christian Church should be appointed? And yet we are told by a large section of the Church of England that these officers appointed by politicians, and upon political grounds, are the direct successors of the apostles; that they possess the sole right in this country to act as the representatives of Christ, and that upon them has descended the Holy Spirit, conferring upon them supernatural powers, and that the Nonconformists who do not own allegiance to them, although they may be the holiest men living, are heretics and schismatics, and almost beyond the pale of salvation!

These doctrines are being taught at the present day, to my certain knowledge, in multitudes of towns and villages. Hence it is necessary to show how the appointments are made which are supposed to confer these marvellous supernatural powers styled "the apostolic succession." This was the way in which Bishop Luxmore was appointed to St. Asaph in the early part of the nineteenth century, a man who succeeded in grasping for himself and family the sum of £27,000 a year, and it was reckoned that at one time he and his family held in their hands half the value of the livings in the diocese of St. Asaph. Such things as these cast a light upon this doctrine of apostolic succession. They enable a Christian mind to judge how far our Divine Lord and Saviour sanctions this theory, and whether it is His will that these sacred offices should be bartered away for such low worldly motives, and yet that these covetous men should receive the gift of the Holy Spirit so as to constitute them rulers of the Church of God, and to make schismatics of all who do not obey their authority.

We require to bring out these facts because there is no other way in which we can exhibit the preposterous nature of the claim now urged by a section of the national church. I have spoken about the appoint-

ment of bishops, but the same principle applies to the presentations to livings in the Church of England, which are mostly in the hands of patrons. Some of these patrons are public, so to speak, such as the Lord Chancellor and the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. Many of the bishops have also large powers of presentation; and another large section of livings, more than one-half, are in the hands of private patrons. In regard to public patrons, I have some little opportunity of knowing the facts, because a considerable number of such appointments have come under my notice. I can only say this: that it appears to me to be a most improper way of choosing men to perform spiritual functions. As to the distribution of private patronage, I know very little except that in many instances they are dispensed for personal considerations, or by the influence of friends urging upon the patrons to give the appointment to so and so. I cannot believe this is the right way of choosing a minister of the Church of God. In regard to the patronage in the hands of private persons, there is a continual buying and selling in the public market, just as we buy or sell a house, a farm or a flock of sheep. If you read through the clerical newspapers you will sometimes see advertisements to this effect :—

"A valuable living for sale in the suburbs of London. Sale urgent. Prospect of early possession. Net income £900. Light work. The best society. Practically no poor."

I have read several such advertisements myself. I say it is scandalous to permit this method of handing over that most solemn office, the cure of souls. Now, lest I should be thought to speak unjustly, I have brought an extract from a charge by the late Bishop Magee, who afterwards became Archbishop of York, and whose premature death we all so much deplored. Christians of all classes honoured Bishop Magee. This is what he said :—

"First, there are one hundred patrons in England, not presumably better or wiser than other patrons, who have the right to keep the parishes in their gift as long as they please without a pastor, who, when he is appointed, need produce no evidence that he is even in holy orders no testimonial as to his character, and who may buy from one of these patrons the right, without check, hindrance, or so much as question from any human being, to enter upon a cure of souls, and who, moreover, by that purchase may have been enabled to complete some nefarious transaction respecting some other piece of Church preferment, of which he may be the owner. . . . Again, it is a fact that a certain number of patrons are in the habit, whenever their livings fall vacant, of selecting the oldest and most decrepit clergymen they can find, after the most careful search and inquiry, and putting them into their livings, in order to enhance the selling value of these in the market—a proceeding which I regard as one of deliberate and enormous wickedness, and yet which, at present, may be, and is adopted in defiance of parishioners and of bishops, for there are absolutely no limits in law to the age or decrepitude of a presentee . . . Again it is a fact that any parishioner knowing of any immorality in the clergyman about to be appointed in his parish, dare not represent it to the bishop through

dread of an action for libel. . . . Again, it is a fact that immoral and scandalous clerks are sometimes presented, as I personally know, to bishops for institution by patrons who are well aware of their character. . . . Again, it is a fact that an infant in his cradle may be nominated to the largest and most populous parish in England, that it shall be kept open for him by a resignation bond until he attains the ripe age of twenty-four, when he forthwith enters upon the duties of the parish, the temporary incumbent being turned out to make room for him, or, if he is not at once removed, remaining the life-tenant of the patron, and liable to ejectment at any moment."

The Bishop closed this statement by saying :—

" I confess that as I cite the facts that I have now narrated, I hardly know which to be most ashamed of—that evils so scandalous, abuses so notorious as those I have described and proved, should exist in our church, beneath the shelter of its laws, or that there should be clergymen and gentlemen capable of defending them." [1]

What answer can be given to this ? Nobody doubts the truth of it. I could quote similar statements over and over again from many of the most eminent men in the Church of England. I ask is this scriptural, is it according to the Christian teaching that " God is a Spirit, and that they who worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth ? " Did He intend that the cure of souls should become the basis of traffic : He who turned the buyers and sellers out of the Temple, and drove them out with a scourge of small cords : did He intend that the holiest of all offices should be bought and sold like a flock of sheep ? No Christian can be found to answer that there was such intention, It is an utter perversion of the teaching of God's Word. Yet the claim is now made by thousands of the clergy that they are the sole representatives of the apostles in England, and that all who are outside the national church are guilty of the deadly sin of schism. Now I ask could these abuses have arisen had the church been separated from the state, and controlled by its people. I say it would have been impossible. The union of Church and State is at the bottom of two great tendencies which have marked the national church for 300 years. The first is want of sympathy with popular liberty, and the second an increasing sympathy with sacerdotalism.

No one who has carefully read the history of England, especially the critical times between the Armada and the revolution of 1688, but knows what terrible dangers this country passed through, and no one can read it without knowing the bitter spirit which the national church showed towards Nonconformists during that period. The best and holiest men in England and Scotland spent much of their lives in prison, simply because they asserted their right to preach God's Holy Word to the people. John Bunyan, Richard Baxter, George Fox, and many others spent a large portion of their time in gaol merely for doing this. In Wales the persecution continued to the last century. The great

[1] The passing of the Clergy Discipline Act and the Benefices Act in the last decade have removed, I should hope, the worst of these evils, but patronage still remains.

Methodist revival provoked the bitterest persecution on the part of the church. The national church had so neglected its duty that Wales had almost relapsed into heathenism, as indeed most of England had. The great revival of religion in Wales was outside the national church, and its leaders were persecuted by that church as all students of history know. The bishops of the Church of England have fought against every great movement in favour of human progress even down to the present century. They voted against the abolition of slavery; they voted against Catholic emancipation; they voted against the first reform bill; they voted against the repeal of the corn laws; they voted against Jewish emancipation; and they voted against opening Universities to Dissenters. There must be some deep underlying cause to move the chief officers of a great Christian church to so steadily set themselves against those movements which make for the benefit of the nation. There are, I know, many godly men in the Church of England, whose names we honour, who utterly repudiated the action taken by the dignitaries of the church, in always identifying themselves with the party of privilege against the party of popular rights. There must be some deep fundamental underlying cause to produce such a state of things. I can conceive no other cause except the benumbing influence of the alliance of the church with the state. Had it been a free episcopal church like the Episcopal Church in America, it would have been just as much in favour of liberty and human progress as every other branch of the Christian church.

Nothing else calls for special mention this year. I spent the autumn as usual in Perthshire, and the winter in Liverpool, having many meetings and engagements in Liverpool and my constituency. The depression of trade was very great this winter, with vast crowds of unemployed people in all our large cities. There was much distress in Liverpool, by no means confined to the working classes. Many commercial men fell into great poverty. The extraordinary decline in the price of cotton and its products brought great losses on Lancashire. The price of standard American cotton, which averaged *7d.* per lb. when I commenced business in 1860, and which during the famine caused by the American Civil War shot up to *2s. 6d.* per lb., had settled to an average of *6d.* per lb. some years before this; but it had been steadily falling for some years, and reached the extraordinarily low price of $2\frac{7}{8}d.$ per lb. towards the end of this year. No one could have made provision for such a fall, and the result was widespread suffering all through Lancashire. A great reaction occurred the following year or two. Then in 1898 the price again fell to $2\frac{7}{8}d.$, from which it has risen to an average of *4d.* or *5d.* per lb. the last few years.

More or less the same experience applied to the principal articles

of commerce. The efficient cause, as I have stated before, was not merely cheapened production, but the increased value of the gold standard by which all prices were measured. The great revival of trade the last few years—in America even more than here—has arisen largely from the cessation of this down-grade tendency, and the strong upward bias of general prices. No doubt the forces have now exhausted themselves which for twenty years after the demonetization of silver in 1873, forced down prices in all gold-using countries, and the tendency is now in the opposite direction. Though momentarily stopped by the South African War, the reopening of the gold mines at Johannesburg will soon make itself felt on the gold supply of the world, and therefore I do not anticipate in the near future such terrible and protracted periods of depression as we had in the seventies, the eighties, and early nineties. Fluctuations in prices will always exist: times of prosperity and adversity will follow each other in cycles; but the element of a change in the standard of value should, if possible, be eliminated, and when it does occur from natural causes it is better that it be in the direction of more abundant, not less abundant, supplies of the precious metals.[1]

[1] The economist Jevons has said: "I cannot but agree with M'Culloch that, putting out of sight individual causes of hardship, if such exist, a fall in the value of gold must have a most powerfully beneficial effect. It loosens the country, as nothing else could, from its old bonds of debt and habit. It throws increased rewards before all who are making and acquiring wealth somewhat at the expense of those who are enjoying acquired wealth. It excites the active and skilful classes of the community to new exertions, and is to some extent like a discharge from his debts is to the bankrupt, long struggling with his burdens."

The historian, Hume, writes: "We find that in every kingdom into which money begins to flow in greater abundance than formerly everything takes a new face. Labour and industry gain life, the merchant becomes more enterprising, the manufacturer more diligent and skilful, and even the farmer follows his plough with greater alacrity and attention."

CHAPTER XXXVII

Session of 1895—Defeat of the Government—General Election—Free Trade and Protection

BEFORE Parliament met this Session I took a run to Pau, where I had an invalid sister. The weather was very cold. Deep snow lay most of the time in the South of France, and when we returned to England an astoundingly cold wave passed over the country. The thermometer went below zero in the Midlands. The Thames and Mersey were full of floating ice, and the sufferings of the unemployed people were intense. Great sickness and a heavy mortality occurred, and I was called to mourn the loss of my aged mother, who was called away at my house in Liverpool at the age of eighty-three—one of the most kind and unselfish of women, and the best of mothers. We laid her to rest in the family tomb at Borgue. The roads were still lined with deep banks of snow left by the unprecedented storm of February, which buried many houses in the South of Scotland, and made the roads impassable for several days. Even railway trains were snowed up, and the passengers almost starved and frozen with cold. It literally reproduced the terrific snowstorm described in *The Raiders*—the best book by Crockett. Had the funeral been a few days earlier we could scarcely have made our way to the rural churchyard. There stood by the grave as one of the chief mourners an old and faithful servant, John Sword, in his ninetieth year. He had been sixty-two years in the service of the family. For shrewdness, fidelity and Scotch humour he might have given Sir Walter Scott one of his finest portraits; he was like Eleazar, whom Abraham trusted with all he had—a type not too common nowadays. The Rev. George Elder, my mother's highly-esteemed and able minister, performed the service. In that tomb lie five of my ancestors and relatives, whose average age was eighty-eight!

I was at the opening of Parliament on February 5. On the

address the first amendment was only defeated by twelve. It soon became clear that the ministry could not hold office long, and so a sort of unreality was imparted to the legislation of the Session, the chief measure of which was the Welsh Disestablishment Bill, most ably conducted by Mr. Asquith. A useful Factory and Workshops Bill was passed, which brought small workshops under inspection.

In the spring of this year our excellent Speaker, Mr. Peel, resigned owing to failing health. He carried with him the deep respect of the whole House. Mr. Gully was appointed his successor, by a majority of eleven votes over Sir Matthew White Ridley. He also has worthily supported the great reputation of the Chair by a rare judicial faculty and a singular evenness of temper. Few posts are more difficult to fill than that of Speaker of the House of Commons, especially as the responsibility of putting motions of Closure now rests mainly with the Chair. There are times when firmness—even sternness—are necessary, and it is impossible wholly to avoid friction; but it will be allowed that for many years our Parliament has set the example of choosing presiding officers singularly fitted for their high office.

Great anxiety was felt in England this year on account of the sufferings of the Armenian population in Asiatic Turkey. They had always been oppressed by the Turks. Yet by means of stipulations in the Treaty of Berlin, in which the Porte guaranteed their enjoyment of civil rights, and by the presence of British Consuls in the principal towns of Asia Minor, a tolerable degree of security had been attained. This country, under Lord Beaconsfield, had guaranteed to Turkey the possession of her Asiatic provinces on condition of her carrying out reforms for the benefit of her Christian subjects, and so we had a treaty right of interference in case of gross misgovernment. Some terrible cases of massacre occurred this year, and strong representations were made to the Porte, which were as usual met by illusory promises. Deep anxiety was felt by the nation, all the more as it soon became evident that no reliance could be placed on either Russia or Germany to back up the remonstrances of this country. It was not, however, till the following year that the awful horrors of the Armenian massacres burst upon Europe. It was most unfortunate that a change of Government occurred just at the time when strenuous and persistent pressure was needed at Constantinople. It weakened our influence and encouraged the Sultan in his diabolical policy.

Towards the end of June the Government sustained a trifling defeat on the question of the supply of cordite powder—a mere casual division on a vote in supply in a small House. Such defeats have never been treated as the equivalent of a vote of want of confidence; but Campbell-Bannerman, the Minister for War, resigned, and the Cabinet decided to follow his example. I suppose the truth was that they found it impossible to drive their team much longer. They had met with much difficulty in piloting the Welsh Disestablishment Bill through Committee. Their majorities had fallen almost to the vanishing point. The bye-elections were going against them, and they thought it hopeless to pass further legislation, as their Bills were sure to be thrown out by the Lords. And thus the legislative harvest of the Session was lost, and we were plunged into an election in July.

When Lord Rosebery resigned Lord Salisbury formed an administration in which Lord Hartington (now the Duke of Devonshire) and Mr. Chamberlain took leading parts. The union between the two wings of the Party was now formally sealed, and an appeal was made to the country to support a Unionist administration. The result was astonishing. The Liberal Party went to pieces. Sir Wm. Harcourt lost his seat at Derby, but was soon after returned for West Monmouthshire: and a great number of prominent Liberals had similar misfortunes. If I remember rightly I was the only one of seven Liberals hailing from Liverpool who retained his seat, and by a reduction of 1,000 in my majority. Among these were my friends, Stephen Williamson, Caine, Billson, Crossfield, and Snape. Great Britain only returned 177 Liberals against 390 Unionists, and when the Irish Nationalists were added we were in a minority of 152. No such sweeping victory had been obtained by either side since the reformed Parliament which met in 1832! Even in Wales, the most Liberal part of the Kingdom, six seats were lost (all in South Wales). The whole aspect of Parliament has been entirely changed ever since. As there has often been great friction between the Liberals and the Nationalists, the real Unionist majority was much larger than these figures indicate, and it continues so to this day, but little affected by the election of 1900.

The real cause of the disaster was increasing distrust of Mr. Gladstone's Irish policy. So much was this felt that many of us dropped Home Rule out of our programme, and fought the election on other grounds. But added to this were two potent

causes—the great liquor trade in all its branches was thoroughly frightened by Harcourt's adoption of the principle of local veto, and it used its enormous wealth and influence in a way that can only be described as unscrupulous. The leading temperance advocates were thereby driven out of Parliament, such men as Sir Wilfrid Lawson and W. S. Caine. But the great depression of trade had also much to do with the change. A strong movement sprang up in favour of what was called Fair Trade, or Reciprocity. I found in contesting my constituency a very strong feeling, especially among the farmers, in favour of a return to some form of protection. The distress was very great in all our industrial centres, and especially among the agricultural population. I never found so little enthusiasm among the Welsh people. Poverty and suffering had chilled their ardour, and they were open to the blandishments of flatterers who promised in a vague way some kind of protection for suffering industries.

I may take this opportunity of saying that I believe a great change has passed over this country on the question of Free Trade. It is no longer regarded as a panacea for all national evils. It was at one time elevated to a sort of fetish worship by men who did not comprehend its limitations. It was treated as an axiom of economical orthodoxy universally true, and any doubt was treated as heresy was by Torquemada. It is now acknowledged that it is only true with modifications, or rather, that though true as an abstract proposition, it needs to be applied with regard to the concrete phenomena of life. All nations except our own have gone in an opposite direction. The United States and our Colonies have flourished exceedingly under a contrary policy. None but ideologues would now accuse the American people, the shrewdest on earth, of being blind to their own interest. It is a matter of common knowledge that no nation since the world began has advanced with such rapidity in wealth and commerce as the United States in the past fifty years; yet it has increasingly adopted a protective policy. Our exports to that country are not more than they were fifty years ago, while we now import three or four times as much, and the balance of trade between us and the United States shows some 119 millions sterling a year in their favour![1]

[1] Our exports to the United States averaged from 1855 to 1859 nineteen millions sterling per annum; our total exports to that country in 1900 amounted to nineteen millions, eight hundred thousand sterling. The total imports from the United States

The real argument in favour of Free Trade for the United Kingdom is that we need cheap food and raw materials to enable us to be the cheapest producer. We must of necessity export largely of our manufactures to pay for the food of our dense population. We import half of our food from abroad, and a great part of the raw materials of our industries, and therefore we must have these elements of national life at the cheapest cost.[1]

Other nations that produce their own food and raw materials, like the United States and our Colonies, desire also to have manufacturing industries. They are willing to pay more for their goods for a term of years in order to draw to their shores the skilled labour and capital needed to produce them. By that policy hundreds of thousands of our artisans and hundreds of millions of our capital have been attracted to the United States and to our Colonies, which are now competing with us. These young countries consider that they are amply compensated for a period of higher prices by the great accession they get to their national resources; and they look forward to a time when protection will be no longer needed, and they can compete with the old countries of Europe on equal terms. Practically the United States has already reached that stage, and there is little doubt that if all protection were abolished the United States would run us hard in the field of open competition. They have developed their machinery quite beyond us, and have much more efficient labour, and their huge "trusts" and combinations have massed their vast trades together under the ablest management the world has ever seen. Their great steel trust has a capital of a billion dollars (200 millions sterling), and they have expended fabulous amounts to perfect every modern appliance, while we are still working with processes which are superseded in the United States. The one drawback to cheap production in the United States is that wages

averaged from 1855 to 1859 thirty-three millions per annum; in 1900 they amounted to the enormous sum of a hundred and thirty-three millions, eight hundred thousand sterling!—*Financial Reform Almanack.*

[1] There is much to be said in favour of a moderate duty on manufactured goods imported into this country, especially articles of luxury like silks. By imposing such duties we would have something to bargain with in asking for lower duties on our goods by foreign nations. I see little objection to reciprocal free trade brought about in that way. It is certainly better than the one-sided free trade we now have. Yet I also feel strongly the great advantage we have in our simple fiscal system as compared with the scheming and plotting and bribery by the protected interests in countries which reject our free-trade system. I say "Let well alone" unless a very strong case be made out to the contrary.

are nearly twice as high as in Great Britain, but the American workman is far more temperate, puts through much more work, and adopts every economising expedient. In Great Britain the workmen often fight against improvements in machinery. They are under the fatal delusion that to diminish the output is the best way to secure full employment. Consequently our employers have often to forego the inventions used in America in order to avoid strikes. It is quite impossible we can permanently compete with America if our hands are tied behind our backs.

Mere strumming upon the shibboleths of the days of Cobden and Bright—true at the time they were uttered—will not save us, and a fresh survey of the whole industrial situation is absolutely necessary.[1]

These things were dimly seen at the election of 1895, but I adhered strictly to Free Trade, and declined to pledge myself to any measure of protection. I still hoped we would struggle through our difficulties, which soon came to pass, for a trade revival began in 1896 which soon swelled into a flood of prosperity, lasting till 1901, and gave us probably the best five years of trade we have ever had—certainly the best since 1868–73.

The election was fought at the very worst time for the Liberal cause, and I should think marks the lowest stage in the fortunes of the Party.

I may say that my election contest lasted nearly three weeks, and I addressed about forty meetings. I had my son and his companion with me most of the time. Gordon was a keen politician and was now quite a companion and helper in all my work.

[1] See Appendix XIV., where I reproduce my address on Reciprocity and Free Trade.

CHAPTER XXXVIII

The New Parliament—The Movement against Ritualism—The Armenian Massacres—The Venezuela Dispute—The Jameson Raid

A SHORT meeting of Parliament took place after the election for swearing in members and formal business. We met on August 12, and such a change was exhibited as altered the whole complexion of the House. A large section of the old Liberal Party was gone: a crowd of new members had come in. I felt it very trying. Most of my friends had lost their seats, and a feeling of strangeness and solitude came over one. During the course of a Parliament running for some years kindly associations grow up. Men come to understand one another: members shake down into their proper places. The House takes a true measure of the capacity and character of its active men, and the Speaker knows whom to call on each leading question. All this has to be re-learned when a new House meets, especially when a revolution of opinion has altered its composition, and the first Session is partly spent in getting to know one another.

I spent, as usual, the autumn in Scotland. It was unusually wet after the long drought earlier in the year. Our seasons seem to have got astray about this time. We had droughts for several years in the spring and early summer, when the earth needs most moisture, and drenching rains in the harvest time, which injured the crops. Combined with the very low prices, farmers had a most trying time.

A strong revulsion against the extreme ritualism in the National Church was now showing itself, and one outcome was the establishment of a Protestant congress, which met every year in one of the principal towns. This year it met at Preston, and I attended and presided at a huge meeting of 4,000 people in the principal hall of the town. There was great zeal and enthusiasm. Preston

is one of the Lancashire towns which has a considerable Roman Catholic population, but this rather tended to stiffen the backs of the Protestants, as was also the case in Liverpool and Manchester. Where the rival creeds come sharply into contact there is always less room for intermediate shades of opinion; and English sacerdotalism, which is an imitation of Rome, finds no quarter there. This is the reason why the Protestantism of Ireland is so much more pronounced, and why the Episcopal Church there is so much more evangelical than the sister Church in England.

The winter this year was darkened by further massacres of Armenian Christians. I had seen much of the Thoumaians in London. Madame Thoumaian, a Swiss missionary married to an Armenian professor, haunted the lobbies of the House of Commons for months in the endeavour to get her husband released from a Turkish prison. At last she succeeded through the agency of the British Ambassador. They came to Liverpool to stir up public feeling on behalf of the crowds of Armenians that languished in Turkish dungeons, many of whom were being slowly tortured to death. I never listened to such harrowing stories of human suffering. Since the days of Nero, when the Christians were smeared with pitch and lighted as lamps for the streets of Rome, no such sufferings were endured for conscience' sake as befell this unhappy race. I was afflicted with insomnia, caused by the shocking accounts that reached us, and when the Thoumaians asked me to get up a public meeting I willingly complied. I was greatly disappointed with the apathy of the public. I found it almost impossible to get the co-operation of leading citizens of either Party. The contrast was extraordinary between the feeling caused by the Bulgarian massacres in the Russo-Turkish War, when Mr. Gladstone set fire to the heather, and especially during his Midlothian campaign, when he tore to pieces the pro-Turkish policy of Beaconsfield, and the tame way in which the news of far greater massacres in Armenia were now received. I can only account for it by the theory that faith and zeal were under an eclipse in Great Britain. All good causes that involved self-sacrifice were equally depressed. Nations have periods of moral ascent and moral decline. As the Restoration succeeded the Commonwealth, as the vice of Charles II. followed the Puritan sternness of Cromwell, so, when Mr. Gladstone's afflatus was withdrawn, a great downward reaction occurred. No doubt the difficulty of intervening was very great. The risk of a European war was not to be despised. Russia

was instigating the Porte to refuse our advice, and the German Emperor about this time took the Sultan under his patronage! Lord Rosebery's and Lord Salisbury's Governments were alike baffled by the difficulties, and the Sultan availed himself of the jealousies of Europe to get rid of a section of his subjects whose rising wealth and intelligence filled him with alarm.

We succeeded in getting up a large and enthusiastic meeting at Hope Hall, over which I presided, but we failed to induce any of the leaders to take part except Mr. Watts, late Lord Mayor, who made a vigorous speech. I went soon after to Edinburgh and addressed a large meeting there. The *Scotsman* ridiculed the movement and scarcely reported the meeting. Indeed, the Tory and Unionist Press seemed to think that espousing the Armenian cause meant a censure on the Government. Mr. Gladstone broke his retirement, and by means of letters and pamphlets tried to stimulate the national conscience. Later in the movement he addressed a great meeting at Hengler's Circus, Liverpool, of a non-party character, where the chiefs of both parties were present. It was a wonderful feat for a man of his great age, and it was almost his last public appearance. I could not conceive of a more fitting close to a noble life.

Two events happened towards the end of this year, which shattered all hope of intervention in Turkey. The message of President Cleveland regarding Venezuela exploded like a bombshell. Hardly any one knew or cared about an obscure dispute which had been going on for years respecting the boundary line between British Guiana and Venezuela; but the American Government had been watching it and, conceiving that the "Monroe doctrine" had been infringed, appealed to Lord Salisbury to refer it to arbitration. This appeal had not been acted upon with sufficient promptitude to please our impetuous cousins, and Cleveland issued a message in most undiplomatic language, which sounded like an ultimatum.[1]

[1] President Cleveland's Message, December 16, 1895:—

1. recited the Monroe doctrine and said "it cannot become obsolete while our Republic endures";

2. averred that it had its place in International law;

3. recited that the United States suggested arbitration, and that the British Government declined;

4. stated that, the British Government having declined arbitration, nothing remained but to accept the situation, to recognize its plain requirements, and to deal with it accordingly;

5. suggested that Congress should appoint a Commission to inquire into *Boundary* question.

For a short time an outburst of what the Americans call "spread-eagleism" was witnessed in that country. The Press clamoured for war if England did not back down. The pulpit, on the other hand, denounced this explosion of temper, and called for peace. The better sense of the Americans soon came round to that view. The British people and Press showed great self-restraint. They felt that it would be equally wicked and absurd to quarrel over such a trifle, and an arbitration court was arranged with the United States, to which the dispute with Venezuela was referred, and the matter was quickly composed. Two subsequent visits to the United States have shown me that the better class of Americans regretted the action of Cleveland; but they also show that nothing touches the American people more than any intrusion of European Power on the American Continent. Fortunately there is no conceivable motive to lead us to go counter to their wishes. Statesmen on both sides are equally desirous to live at peace, and I hope that this short-lived dispute will be the last that will trouble the peace of the two English-speaking nations. The sooner we get a treaty of arbitration arranged the better. The fault is not with us, nor with either the late President or his successor. It altogether lies with the American Senate, which refused to ratify the last treaty concluded between our Government and that of Mr. McKinley. During the height of the excitement I published the following letter in the *Times* :—

THE VENEZUELAN CRISIS.

To the Editor of the "Times."

SIR,—Permit me to offer some remarks upon this deplorable dispute with the United States which has suddenly burst upon us like a bolt from the blue sky.

Ten days ago not one person in a thousand knew anything of the question, and scarcely could point out on a map where Venezuela or British Guiana was. Now we have been discussing at least the possibility of a fratricidal war which would half ruin both countries, and could do no possible good to either. Is it not the part of wisdom, not to speak of Christianity, to try and find a permanent escape from this and all similar complications ?

What is the substance of the claim of the United States ? Is it not broadly that no European Power shall extend its territory in either North or South America, or interfere with the Republican form of government wherever it is established ? This "Monroe doctrine" was first suggested to the Government of the United States by our own George Canning, who sought by means of it to prevent Spain coercing her revolted colonies. Is there anything in it which we need to con-

test? Certainly not. We do not wish to increase our possessions in America, either North or South. We have more territory than we can well govern all over the world, and to go to war with the United States on the ground of a frontier dispute with Venezuela would be almost as absurd as Swift's story of Lilliput and the adjacent island fighting about the proper end of an egg to break! No doubt the claim as put forward by President Cleveland seems to us needlessly offensive; no wonder that the British public, understanding little of the matter, deeply resented it. It seemed to them a piece of impertinence to interfere in a frontier dispute between two independent States. But we are now beginning to understand better the American point of view. There, they are not like us, almost ignorant of the question; for months, indeed for years, past Venezuela has been entreating that great country to save their little State from what they regard as the unjust claims of Great Britain. The American Press has been discussing the question at great length the past few months, and, hearing only the case of Venezuela, has regarded this country as entirely in the wrong. It has concluded that under the name of a boundary dispute this country has sought to annex a large portion of Venezuelan territory; in this way it regards it as an infringement of the Monroe doctrine, which doctrine, though not a part of international law, has been tacitly accepted by this country. What the United States claimed, as I understand, was that Great Britain should refer the whole dispute to arbitration. President Cleveland, in his Message last year, referred to this question in the following friendly terms:—

"The boundary of British Guiana still remains in dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela. Believing its early settlement on some just basis alike honourable to both, and as it is in the line of our established policy to remove from this hemisphere all causes of differences with Powers beyond the sea, I shall renew the efforts heretofore made to bring about the restoration of diplomatic relations between the disputants and to induce a reference to arbitration, a resort which Great Britain so conspicuously favours in principle and respects in practice, and which is earnestly sought by her weaker adversary."

There is nothing in this that is opposed to our national feelings. Surely it was a great mistake for us not to have acted on this friendly suggestion. I see that Mr. Atherley-Jones has stated that in 1885 Lord Granville agreed to arbitrate on all differences between the contracting parties, but owing to Lord Salisbury's accession to power the offer was not acted on. Does not this point to some mistake on our part? If our case was a good one why did we refuse to arbitrate? This dispute has been going on for fifty years, and we have all that time refused arbitration; now our Government offers to arbitrate on a section of the disputed territory, but declines to submit the most important portion. Is this really such a vital question that it should imperil the peace of the world? Have we not been the foremost nation to advocate international arbitration? Did we not create a noble precedent in submitting the Alabama claims to this mode of settlement, and did not this wise policy make for peace all the world

over? Did not the British Parliament pass a unanimous vote for an arbitration treaty with the United States only two or three years ago, and was not a memorial to this effect, signed by over 300 M.P.'s, taken to Washington by a deputation of members and most favourably received there? Had this treaty been concluded we should not now be confronted by this risk of war. Surely it is not too late to retrace our steps a little and leave the whole dispute alike with Venezuela and the United States to friendly and independent arbitration. There can be nothing dishonourable in this; it would be worthy of a nation which professes to be governed by the ethics of Christianity. Is it not a melancholy thought that at Christmas-time we hear of nothing but rumours of war? Here, at the end of the nineteenth century after the birth of Christ, when the angels sang "Peace on earth and good will to men," the whole sky is overspread by dark storm-clouds. The six Powers at Constantinople are so filled with jealousy of each other that they practically connive at the extermination of the Armenian Christians rather than combine in their defence. Any one can see that they are groping about in a powder magazine, and now, to add to the dismal outlook, we have the two greatest and most civilized nations in the world brought to a deadlock, out of which it is not impossible there may be no exit except by war.

Do people on either side of the Atlantic realize what war between the United States and Great Britain would mean? I was in America the year before the Civil War commenced in 1860. The same violent language was then used by the American Press which we hear now; but few in this country believed that the Americans would be so mad as "to imbrue their hands in each other's blood." Nevertheless, the war commenced. Then it was freely predicted in the North that it would be over in ninety days, but it lasted four years; it cost 500,000 lives and one thousand millions sterling, and left excessive bitterness behind it. Are we to contemplate even the bare possibility of the same thing being repeated on a far larger scale? The American Union then contained thirty two millions of people: it now contains seventy millions (including eight millions of coloured people), and Great Britain and her colonies contain fifty millions; I do not count the coloured races subject to us, for they are not a source of strength. If this great aggregation of peoples should go to war it would last for years, and the destruction of life and property would be appalling.

Consider what the position of Canada would be on this hypothesis. No doubt the Canadians would stick to the mother country, and the tremendous task would be thrown upon five millions of peaceful citizens of defending their country against a nation of seventy millions, backed by whatever aid our country could afford. Our fleet could probably blockade the American ports; but, though they would suffer immensely, we should damage ourselves as much, for we cannot do without their corn and cotton, and all over the world our gigantic trade would be exposed to the depredations of privateers, for the United States has not agreed to the Declaration of Paris abolishing privateering. Consider the position of our industrial population deprived of the raw

materials of some of our greatest industries. Further, consider how this country would be hampered in Asia and Africa, where we have immense interests to defend, what our position would be if another Indian mutiny broke out, or Russia developed an aggressive policy. Our national interests are far more in the East than the West; and we need all our resources to defend them.

Surely it is better to look these facts in the face than cover our head like an ostrich in the sand. Brother Jonathan is very irritating at times: he has the arrogance of youth and strength; he has our own qualities in an exaggerated form; but in spite of his offensive ways of asserting himself I doubt if he really wishes to injure the old country. The peculiarity of an Anglo-American war is that neither party can damage the other without equally hurting itself. Such a war is virtual suicide. Let both sides act, as Mr. Gladstone suggests, with "common-sense," and leave this thorny question to peaceable arbitration and save the cause of humanity and civilization.

I remain, yours truly,

Liverpool, Dec. 27. SAMUEL SMITH.

One effect of this passing storm was seriously to cripple our Government in dealing with Turkey. At the very time when a show of force was necessary, the distraction on the side of America paralyzed our right arm. The American missionaries in Asiatic Turkey, who had done more than any others to elevate the Armenian people, had the mortification of seeing their converts massacred the more wantonly because their Government quarrelled with ours about a trumpery dispute in South America. To add to the irony of the situation, Venezuela has since then quarrelled both with Germany and the United States, and refuses to admit that it is in any way indebted to the latter!

The other event that came like a bolt from the blue sky has had far more enduring consequences.

Affairs in South Africa had been in a tangle for a long time. The gold discoveries in the Transvaal had attracted a crowd of immigrants, chiefly British, to the gold-bearing district called the Rand, of which Johannesburg was the capital. The Boer population—a race of primitive farmers—dreaded the influx of foreigners which threatened to swamp their hard-won independence. They elected as president Mr. Kruger, filled with the same prejudice against all things British and modern, and he obstinately refused to give the rights of citizenship to the new comers. Meanwhile the development of the gold industry became phenomenal. The crowds of immigrants far exceeded the Dutch burgher population. Great fortunes were made, and the wealth was used to agitate

for the right of self-government. The great figure of Cecil Rhodes towered above all others in South Africa. He had genius and ambition of a high order, and ideals which were certainly not selfish or ignoble. He became Premier of Cape Colony, and the guiding spirit of Africander policy. His original intention was to unite the Dutch and British elements in one compact nationality, and to bring all the States of South Africa into a confederation under the British flag. But it gradually became clear that President Kruger and his entourage would not consent to their absorption in a British State, even though self-governing like Canada or Australia. It also became clear that Dutch ambitions for a united South Africa were growing apace, but with the ultimate aim of creating a Dutch nationality. A duel *à outrance* developed between these two determined and powerful men, and in an evil hour Rhodes conceived the plan of upsetting the Transvaal Government by a conspiracy. He was indubitably the author of the Raid, but he was powerfully assisted by Alfred Beit, a German Jew, who was the largest capitalist on the Rand. Rhodes deceived the High Commissioner, Sir Hercules Robinson; he deceived his own colleagues; and the police of Rhodesia—the vast province which he had added to the Empire—were placed at the disposal of Major Jameson, his bosom friend. The last and final step was taken without his consent, but the Parliamentary Committee which afterwards investigated the Raid proved conclusively that he was its real author.[1] It ended in a miserable fiasco. It was equally wicked and absurd. It is strange that a commanding intellect like that of Rhodes should have so misconceived the strength of the Boers. Six hundred raiders undertook to do what

[1] Extract from South Africa Committee Report:—

1. Whatever justification there might have been for action on the part of the people of Johannesburg, there was none for the conduct of a person in Mr. Rhodes' position, in subsidizing, organizing, and stimulating an armed insurrection against the Government of the South African Republic, and employing the forces and resources of the Chartered Company to support such a revolution.

2. Mr. Rhodes occupied a great position in South Africa, and, beyond all other persons, should have been careful to abstain from such a course of action as that which he adopted. He seriously embarrassed both the Imperial and Colonial Governments, and his proceeding resulted in an astounding breach of international comity.

3. Such a policy, once embarked upon, inevitably involved Mr. Rhodes in grave breaches of duty to those to whom he owed allegiance. He deceived the High Commissioner representing the Imperial Government; he concealed his views from his colleagues in the Colonial Ministry, and from the Board of the British South Africa Company. He did more, for he led his subordinates to believe that his plans were approved by his superiors.

it has taken about 250,000 men two-and-a-half years to do! "Quem Deus vult perdere, prius dementat." It looked as if reason and common-sense had forsaken Cecil Rhodes.

One does not like to write bitter things about a great man recently deceased, whose noble and far-sighted will shows a lofty patriotism, but truth requires us to say that few events have brought greater calamities on our nation than this ill-starred Raid. One of the first effects was to elicit the following telegram from the German Emperor to President Kruger :—

> I express to you my sincere congratulations that without appealing to the help of friendly Powers you and your people have succeeded in repelling with your own forces the armed bands which had broken into your country, and in maintaining the independence of your country against foreign aggression.

It produced an outburst of feeling in both countries, and the chasm between English and German opinion has widened steadily since then. Now, alas! it seems unlikely to be closed in this generation. Two great nations, formerly friends, and largely consanguineous, are now ranged on opposite sides and each regards the other as a possible adversary. After the Raid a South African war became inevitable, unless complete reparation and disavowal were rendered by our Government. The very first condition was the punishment of Rhodes, the chief culprit, and the abrogation of the charter of the South Africa Company, which was so deeply implicated. But this was not done. Rhodes came to England and was received as a patriot. Only the minor offenders got a short term of imprisonment. The public conscience was demoralized. An abortive inquiry was held by Parliament, and a veil of mystery hung over certain of its proceedings which has not been dispelled to this day! We need not wonder that the Boers after this laid in huge munitions of war, and prepared for a conflict which they considered unavoidable.

I do not wish to imply that the Raid alone is responsible for the South African War. It is obvious that deep underlying causes were at work which would have made it very difficult to avoid collision sooner or later. The Dutch and British ideals were widely different, especially on the subject of treating the native Kaffir population. There is little doubt that ambitions were nursed on both sides which worked for war. Kruger and his Hollander entourage were corrupted by sudden wealth, and in-

toxicated with the dream of a great Dutch Republic embracing all South Africa. On the other hand Rhodes and his allies were equally determined that the confederation of South Africa should be under the British flag. It is possible that these dangers might have been conjured away by patient considerate treatment. Dark threatening clouds often disperse without a thunderstorm. Ties of kinship were rapidly springing up between the two races which at bottom came from a common stock. Old Kruger would have passed away and been succeeded by a more enlightened ruler; but Rhodes and his comrades forced the pace and ended in hastening the catastrophe.

I make these remarks now rather than at a later stage, for I feel that the real starting point of our African troubles was the Raid. Many on the other hand hold that it was the retrocession of the Transvaal after Majuba. I allow that there is something to be said for this view. The ignorant Boers thought that fear and not justice had yielded them independence. They were incapable of understanding the high motives that swayed Mr. Gladstone, and ever since then they greatly overrated their strength. I think a serious mistake was made by Lord Derby in 1884, in foregoing the distinct claim of British suzerainty. Mr. Gladstone had reserved this in the Convention of 1881. It is true that full independence was never conceded, for a reservation was made that this country could annul treaties made by the Transvaal with foreign Powers. But except in that particular, substantial independence was conceded, and we had no legal right to stop the enormous munitions of war that poured into the Transvaal the last few years.

To revert to Armenian affairs, the double distraction on the side of the United States and South Africa completely paralysed the action of our Government, and the massacres went on with redoubled horrors, culminating in the slaughter of several thousand Armenians in Constantinople itself, under the very eyes of the foreign Ambassadors. I do not think anything so atrocious has happened since the massacre of St. Bartholomew, and it is melancholy to think that at the end of the nineteenth century of Christianity there should be so little religion in Europe that the great Powers should stand idly by and allow 100,000 Christians, who could have saved their lives by embracing the Koran, to be massacred by Kurds and Turks!

CHAPTER XXXIX

The Session of 1896—The Armenian Massacres—The Education Question—My Son and Naval Affairs—The Romeward Movement in the Church of England—"The Claims of Rome"

THE year opened with the death of Gordon's companion, who was almost a brother to him, which caused us all great sorrow. I was then at Nice, where we had gone for a little change before the Session began. I returned in time for the opening of Parliament on February 11, and spoke on the address on the Armenian horrors, and was fortunate in securing a sitting for the discussion of the whole subject on March 3. I quoted from the official reports of our own vice-consuls in Asia Minor, and founded on them and on the Anglo-Turkish convention a plea for a stronger policy. I was seconded by Sir John Kennaway, and the debate went on the whole evening, and was worthy of the House of Commons. Excellent speeches were made by Hon. George Curzon, Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs (now Lord Curzon, Viceroy of India); by Sir Edward Grey, the former Under-Secretary; by Mr. Bryce, that true friend of the Christian populations of Turkey; and by Mr. Stevenson. But Sir Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett, Gibson Bowles, and even the great traveller, H. M. Stanley, took the Turkish side—Stanley much less so than the others. With these exceptions the feeling of the House was all that could be wished; but the mischief had now been done. It was a case of closing the stable door after the horse was stolen Little remained to do except to nurse the swarms of orphans that were left as a charge to the American missionaries. This duty has been nobly fulfilled, and I must pay a tribute to the heroism of the lady missionaries particularly—women like Miss Shattuck and Miss Mellinger, who stood between the living and the dead till the plague was stayed. I quote from my speech the following extracts taken from Hansard, reported in the third person:—

Having paid close attention to this question, and having read all the materials he could find on the subject, his belief was that, when they took into account the thousands of villages that were destroyed, often with the butchery of the whole population, the estimate of 50,000 or 60,000 victims given by the best-informed newspapers was about correct, and it must be remembered that in addition to that a far larger number of helpless women and children were turned adrift to starve in the rigour of an Armenian winter, and he believed that the entire loss of life would be incomparably greater than the figures he had given. It was his deliberate conviction, after collecting all the information he could get on this awful subject, that the total loss of life resulting from the atrocities since the beginning of the massacres up to the end of the present winter would not be less than 200,000; and, in addition to that, the remainder of this unhappy people had been reduced in most parts of Turkey to absolute beggary. He knew it was insinuated for some time by the pro-Turkish organs in this country that the Armenians themselves deliberately provoked these massacres by attacks on the Turks. He ventured to say that the Blue-books entirely disproved that preposterous assertion, and that they clearly showed that the massacres were deliberately planned by the authorities—he did not say by the Sultan, though it looked uncommonly like it—and carried out at a given time by armed bands of Turks and Kurds, with scarcely any resistance on the part of the helpless Armenians, who were butchered like sheep. He would quote the account, given on page 69, of the first great massacre of last autumn—that at Trebizond, which was a specimen of twenty or thirty similar massacres:—

"Suddenly, like a clap of thunder in a clear sky, the thing began about 11 a.m. yesterday. Unsuspecting people walking about the streets were shot ruthlessly down. Men standing or sitting quietly at their shop-doors were instantly dropped with a bullet through their heads or hearts. Their aim was deadly, and I have heard of no wounded men. Some were slashed with swords until life was extinct. They passed through quarters where only old men, women and children remained, killing the men and large boys, generally permitting the women and younger children to live. For five hours this horrid work of inhuman butchery went on, the cracking of the musketry, sometimes like a volley from a platoon of soldiers, but more often single shots from near and distant points, the crashing in of doors, and the thud, thud of sword blows sounded on our ears. Then the sound of musketry died away, and the work of looting began. Every shop of an Armenian in the market was gutted, and the victors in this cowardly and brutal war glutted themselves with the spoils. For hours bales of broadcloth, cotton goods, and every conceivable kind of merchandize passed along without molestation to the houses of the spoilers. The intention evidently was to impoverish, and as near as possible to blot out, the Armenians of this town. So far as appearances went, the police and soldiers distinctly aided in this savage work. They were mingled with armed men and, so far as we could see, made not the least effort to check them."

He believed that in almost every case in which evidence had been obtained of Armenians having provoked the outrages, it had been obtained under threat of torture. The fact was that the whole Turkish system was one of deliberate and shameless lying. He would ask the House to listen to one more short quotation, dealing with the massacre at Marsovan. With regard to the first they read that—

"Men and women were killed like sheep, after refusing to accept the Mohammedan faith, which was offered them as their only alternative. The doors of closed shops were broken in, the immates murdered, and the wares dragged out and carried off. Even the iron doors of the Bedestan, or covered bazaar, were smashed with axes, and the whole of it pillaged—not a needle was left. A young Turk of rank was seen meanwhile encouraging the rabble, and shouting to them to make the most of their time. At nightfall the soldiers sent the people to their homes, there being nothing more to plunder. The market was left reeking with blood and strewn with the bodies of men and women stripped to the skin; a cartload of bodies, which were subsequently stripped by the soldiery, remained all night at Kirishhana, unwatched and unguarded from the dogs."

In addition to all this there was a large amount of evidence as to outrages on women and girls, which was quite unfit for publication, and could not be published in the Blue-books. He deduced from these harrowing accounts the following conclusions:—(1) That the massacres were part of a deliberate policy, for in almost every case they were done with the connivance of the authorities; there were a few instances where the governors did their duty, but they were very few indeed. (2) They were confined as a rule to the Armenian Christians; the Greek and Syrian Christians were not molested, and no European was killed. (3) Their object was to exterminate or greatly reduce the Armenian population in those six provinces where the Sultan had promised, under pressure from the Powers, to introduce reforms. The painful truth seemed to be that the earnest and honest efforts of this country to introduce reforms had caused this shocking loss of life. The fact was that Turkey never had and never would grant any reforms except under coercion; as soon as she found out that some of the Powers, especially Russia, would not proceed to coercion she resolved to solve the Armenian Question by massacre. Had she known that the fleets of the Great Powers would go to Constantinople if massacres occurred, there would have been no massacres. The next point which was made clear from the Blue-books was this—that Russia was the Power which was mainly responsible for this failure. So far back as June 14, 1895, Prince Lobanoff informed our Ambassador—

"That Russia would only be too happy to see an improvement of the Turkish administration, and greater security for the lives and property of the Turkish subjects of the Sultan, but she would object to the creation in Asia of a territory where the Armenians should enjoy exceptional privileges. According to the scheme of the Ambassadors this territory would be of very large extent, embracing nearly the

half of Asia Minor. The Armenians in Russia, as he had before told me, were in an excited state, and the authorities had been obliged to take severe measures to prevent them from sending arms and money across the frontier. He could understand that Her Majesty's Government, on account of the distance between England, or indeed any English possessions, and the territory in question, should view the matter with some indifference, but Russia would not consent to the formation of a new Bulgaria on her frontier."

As time went on she became more and more lukewarm, and when the British Government came to the question of coercion she very distinctly stated that she would be no party to it, nor would she allow it. Prince Lobanoff stated on January 25, 1896, that—

"The Russian Government refused to sanction any course of conduct which might lead to a European interference with the internal affairs of Turkey. Prince Lobanoff was content to trust in the goodwill of the Sultan to bring about an amelioration in the condition of his subjects, and preferred to abstain from exercising any further pressure upon his Consuls beyond what could be described as friendly advice."

He thought he need not say more to show why our efforts had proved so utterly abortive, and now he must ask the House to consider what steps they ought to take. Certainly he, for one—and he thought that every one in that House would share the opinion—could not blame the Government for not interfering in Turkey single-handed, and so running the risk of lighting a European war. With international disputes of an acute kind on all sides of us, it was impossible we could take such a risk as that. He was sure this country would have sanctioned the application of force to Turkey had the other Powers ever given us the least approval—but beyond that we could not go. Were we therefore to sit down baffled and insulted by the miscreants who ruled at Constantinople? Were we to watch the extermination of the Armenian people with the criminal callousness that Continental Europe showed? He said certainly not. We inherited the terrible responsibility of having twice propped up the Turkish Empire when it was staggering under fatal blows—once in the Crimean war, and once in 1878, when the Russian army was within ten miles of Constantinople. Russia had then concluded the Treaty of San Stefano, by which she bound Turkey under the following stipulations :—

"Article 16.—As the evacuation by the Russian troops of the territory which they occupy in Armenia, and which is to be restored to Turkey, might give rise to conflicts and complications detrimental to the maintenance of good relations between the two countries, the Sublime Porte engages to carry into effect, without further delay, the improvements and reforms demanded by local requirements in the provinces inhabited by the Armenians, and to guarantee their security from Kurds and Circassians."

Had that treaty been carried out Russia could have forced upon Turkey genuine reforms ; she would not have evacuated Armenia till guarantees had been given, and these horrible massacres would not have occurred ; but this country, through Lord Beaconsfield, forced

Russia to cancel that Treaty, and replaced it, by the collective guarantee of Europe, at Berlin. As the late Lord Sherbrooke well said, "We locked the gates of Hell upon the Armenians by tearing up the Treaty of San Stefano." That was the source of all the evils which we now deplored, and we saw now an entire transformation of the parts played by Russia and Great Britain in 1878. This country then advocated and defended "the integrity and independence of the Ottoman Empire"; now Russia used almost the same language. Russia then put forward the need of guaranteeing the rights of the Christians; now it was England that said that. It would be ludicrous were the consequences not so appalling. But still the question remained, what was to be done? Russia said she would not intervene, nor allow any one else to intervene. This was not so wonderful when we remembered that the war of 1878, which liberated the Bulgarians, cost her 100,000 men and 100 millions of money, and that she was forced to yield up all her conquests. There was no great inducement for her to occupy the barren and wasted Armenian provinces at the cost of a bitter war with the Turks, and a jealous Europe. It would be needful to offer her an inducement, such as a port in the Mediterranean like Alexandretta, and permanent occupation of Armenia and Anatolia. It would be said, what business was it of ours to give away Turkish territory? It arose in this way. We engaged to protect the Christians of Turkey, not merely in the Treaty of Berlin, but by the Anglo-Turkish Convention. Its first Article was to this effect:—

"If Batoum, Ardahan, Kars, or any of them be retained by Russia, and if any attempt shall be made at any future time by Russia to take possession of any further territories of His Imperial Majesty the Sultan in Asia, as fixed by the definitive treaty of peace, England engages to join His Imperial Majesty the Sultan in defending them by force of arms. In return His Imperial Majesty the Sultan promises to England to introduce necessary reforms, to be agreed upon later between the two Powers, into the Government, and for the protection of the Christian and other subjects of the Porte in these territories. And in order to enable England to make necessary provision for executing her engagements, His Imperial Majesty the Sultan further consents to asssign the island of Cyprus to be occupied and administered by England."

He utterly protested against the attempt to explain away this engagement. It was understood by Europe to be a binding obligation that we should give that protection to the Christians which Russia intended to give by the Treaty of San Stefano. We had utterly failed to do so, and justice required us to ask Russia to take back those rights and obligations she legally possessed in 1878. Turkey had utterly failed to perform her part; she could no longer be treated as a civilized Power, and we had every moral right, not merely to permit, but to ask Russia to occupy the provinces where the massacres had occurred. No doubt it would be said that this could not be done without a break-up of the Turkish Empire. He granted it. Was there a man of common humanity who would wish to delay that break-up? Would there not be joy among the angels when that putrid carcase was buried out of

sight? He held that the only policy worthy of this great free people, the mother of Parliaments, was to speed the day when Ottoman barbarism would pass away. This was not the place to propound a scheme for the dismemberment of the Turkish Empire, and no one would expect a responsible Government to pronounce any opinion on the subject, but a private Member might be allowed to say, what multitudes thought, that if France accepted Syria in lieu of Egypt, this country would make an excellent bargain, and those blighted regions, so dear for their historical associations, might regain something of their ancient prosperity. Like many others, he had travelled in the East, and had seen the ruin wrought by Turkish rule. Asia Minor and Mesopotamia were once the most fertile and populous regions of the world; the names of Babylon and Nineveh, of Tyre and Sidon, of Jerusalem and Damascus, recalled great empires now passed away; if these vast regions were brought under civilised government they might again be the home of a great and contented population. Could we not take a part in heralding such a day? Surely it would be a mission worthy of England. It would do much to knit us to our kinsmen in America, who detested Turkish tyranny, and whose noble missionaries had been the chief civilizing force in Armenia. Before sitting down he could not forbear from pleading for a little help for these perishing multitudes. 400,000 to 500,000 Armenians were computed to be destitute and perishing. Private charity was not nearly enough to sustain life. Could not this wealthy country, that had so signally failed to save the Armenians, not from want of will but from want of power, make a grant from the Exchequer to save these poor wretches from dying? He felt sure that the country would willingly support the Government in such a grant. We spent eight millions in relieving the Irish famine, and twenty millions to abolish slavery. It was true the Armenians were not our subjects, but they were in a special sense our *protégés*. A moderate grant to be distributed in the shape of food and clothing through our Consular Agents would stop an incalculable amount of human misery, and make these poor perishing people feel that they were not wholly deserted by Christendom. Whatever view the Government might take of this proposal, he hoped they would cordially support his Resolution. It feebly reflected the deep feeling of this country. This feeling was a mixture of pity and indignation; pity for the most awful sufferings of modern times, and indignation that this diabolical crime should have been consummated in the face of a selfish and corrupt Christendom.

The chief event of the Session was the signal failure of the Government to pass their Education Bill. Though it passed its second reading by 267 of a majority, it had to be withdrawn after long and angry debates. It was conceived in the interest of clerical schools, and included an aid grant to them, but it satisfied no section of the House. It was strongly opposed by several of the Unionist Party, and on an appeal by one of their own supporters it was

withdrawn. It is curious that the greatest Parliamentary difficulties of this Government have been caused by the Education question. As I write (1902) we are in the thick of a conflict on a still more obnoxious Bill which proposes rate aid to voluntary schools on the same basis as Board Schools. Few measures have more deeply affected the Nonconformist sentiment. The present Government have always been largely influenced by the bishops on all church and education questions, and clerical control over the schools has increased of late years. I would here state that I am not a believer in the theory of pure secular education. It has not answered well in France or Australia. When pushed to extremes it tends towards agnosticism. So strongly is this felt in France that the Roman Catholics have established private schools where the bulk of the richer classes are educated. The British people are nearly all in favour of some connexion between the school and religion. The effect on the children even of opening the day by a hymn and prayer and reading a simple portion of Scripture is excellent. I am not in favour of teaching theology strictly so called to young children in the day school. It is not the place for it. Our children in elementary schools are nearly all under thirteen, and are not capable of profiting by the formulae and definitions of theology; but there is a great advantage in bringing their impressionable minds into contact with the holy words and deeds of our Saviour Christ before beginning the work of the day. It is also of great importance to lodge in the memory some of the Psalms and the simpler teaching of the New Testament. I do not believe that one parent in a thousand would object to this. But there is a strong aversion on the part of the Protestant population of Britain to make the elementary school the vehicle of weakening faith in the Reformation, and to teach what is called "Catholic doctrine." There are a few clergy who so abuse their power as to require the children in some Church of England schools to hear Mass on Church holidays, and who instil into their minds the wickedness of dissent. It is these fanatics who are the real stumbling-block to a common agreement on the matter of education. Were clerics content to teach the elementary truths of the Bible and not "Church doctrine" the difficulty would vanish. It is the feeling that the schools are used to proselytize which offends the Protestant Nonconformists, who in 8,000 parishes have no other school to which they can send their children.

But we must not forget that the country owes much to the

many faithful clergy who have built and managed Voluntary schools with the sincere desire of influencing the young for righteousness. The training of the teachers under religious influences secures a respect for divine things which is not seen in schools under purely secular influence. It is most important for the young to see teachers who exemplify in their lives the precepts of Christ. They are influenced more by what they see than by what they learn; and a pious clergyman who selects a teacher of high character confers a great boon on the children of his parish. I freely recognize that there are thousands of such in England. When we bear in mind how little religion is taught in many households, we can perceive that the children might grow up pagans were education wholly divorced from it. In large districts of London, and of all our great cities, many children come from degraded homes, or from streets where vice is glaringly visible. Who can estimate the benefit to such of having a short lesson daily on the holy purifying teachings of our Saviour? I am glad to think that in most of our Board schools there is a sound system of religious instruction. The scheme adopted in Liverpool is excellent; so also in London. The prizes given alike to Board and Voluntary schools for scriptural knowledge proves that there is as much proficiency in one class of schools as in the other. If the Diocesan inspectors appointed by the Church to examine the religious teaching in Church schools would throw the stress on the common elementary truths of Christianity, much of the difficulty would disappear; but several of these inspectors are members of the English Church Union, the High Church organization which, under Lord Halifax, coquets with Rome. This is not encouraging. It keeps up a constant dread that our children in rural districts where only Church schools exist, may be familiarized with sacerdotal doctrine and ritual only too similar to that of Rome.

These are the main elements in the question which make it difficult for a fair-minded man to be a partisan on either side. I cannot go with some of my Liberal friends in wishing to separate education from religion; nor can I go with High Anglicans in leaving the religious teaching, and also the appointment and control of the teaching staff, at the mercy of the parish clergy, who are sometimes narrow and bigoted to a degree. It is a case for careful compromise, and I can only hope that ultimately we may settle down to a working basis which will do substantial justice to all, while leaving scope for the most potent in-

fluence in the training of youth, viz., reverence and the fear of God.

I should add that the great want in our country is still the continuance of education and moral supervision to a later age than the law at present allows. The bulk of the children in our Elementary schools leave before, or at, thirteen years of age. The greater part of them then drop education entirely. In Germany they have to attend evening school to sixteen or seventeen, and thereby are kept out of the temptations of street life, which so greatly demoralize British children. Those who leave school at twelve or thirteen often forget what they have learned. They retain the power of reading "the penny dreadful," or the low illustrated papers which suggest vice or crime. I have looked over many such papers which circulate among children by the hundred thousand, and have often thought it were better not to read at all than contaminate the mind with such trash. It is all important to devise some means to keep a hold on these children after school life. Some future legislator will, I hope, succeed in passing into law the Continuation Schools' Bill, which for ten or fifteen years I introduced annually into Parliament. The real formative period in a child's mind is from thirteen to sixteen. The future of our nation will largely depend upon how that time is used. It is an infinite pity that sectarian disputes should distract attention from this vital question. Along with this is required a far more complete and modern system of secondary education. England is a century behind Germany and far behind the United States, and she has allowed Wales to go much ahead of her. I trust when all the dust and din of our controversies subside, we shall see the fair fabric of the temple of knowledge arise harmoniously adjusted to the needs of all.

Let knowledge grow from more to more
But more of reverence in us dwell:.
That mind and soul according well
May make one music as before.

My son published this summer a pamphlet on "Armed Cruisers," which I made the text of a short speech on the Navy Estimates. He was afterwards referred to by a leading service member as an authority on the subject. He had written several times on this question, and afterwards became a secretary of the Navy League in Liverpool, and one of his pamphlets was widely circulated by

the League.[1] He had quite a remarkable knowledge of naval affairs, especially of the engineering department. As a boy he used to visit the dockyards when he had a holiday, to inspect the warships under construction, and he pointed out to me mistakes in design which had afterwards to be altered at a great expense. It was an inborn taste with him, for no one ever prompted it, and had not his life been cut short he might have attained distinction in that direction. He corresponded with admirals and ships' officers, and had all the latest drawings of naval architects. It was his chief recreation. He paid many visits to Chatham and Portsmouth; also to Birkenhead, when Messrs. Laird had Admiralty contracts on hand, and contributed articles to the local press from the time he was twenty-one!

I may pass for a little to another subject which deeply engrossed me for some time, and links itself on to my public work. I read this summer with deep interest Purcell's *Life of Manning*. It made a very deep impression upon me. I had read long before the interesting—I might almost say pathetic—volume in which Newman related his change of opinion. It impressed me rather as a curious psychological study than as a proof of the power of Rome. But Manning's life revealed the full strength of the flood that was flowing Romeward. It showed that for many minds there was a strange fascination in the arrogant claims of that haughty church. It was not Manning alone, but the large group of men connected with him, who had bowed before that imperious power, and it was clear that many honoured names in the Anglican communion who had "refused to bow the knee to the image of Baal" were perilously near it at one time.

I felt that those who, like myself, traced most of what was great in our nation's life to the breach with Rome in the sixteenth century had to gird themselves to a severe conflict with their old adversary. It was clear that a determined effort was being made to capture the heart of the British Empire. As Manning himself said after his secession: "It is yours, Right Reverend Fathers, to subjugate and to subdue, to bend and break the will of an imperial race, the will which, as the will of Rome of old, rules over nations and peoples, invincible and inflexible."—(From a sermon preached before the Third Provincial Council of Westminster, 1859.)

This work also revealed to me the craft and subtlety which Rome employed for her proselytizing work in Britain. It con-

[1] See Appendix XIV.

firmed all one had read of Jesuitical intrigues and of the underground connexion between the advanced Ritualists and the Roman Church. It showed how easy was the transition from one to another, and how Anglican clergy could retain their orders while secretly convinced of the truth of the claims of Rome. It justified the assertions of Mr. Walsh as to the duplicity that characterized the Romanizing movement in the Church of England, and that it partook largely of the nature of a conspiracy.[1]

The fact is, I awoke to a knowledge of what I had long suspected—of a deep wide-spread conspiracy to undo the Reformation settlement in the National Church, and to bring it, if not into submission to Rome, at least to the closest union with it.

My attention had been drawn for some time past to a subtle propagandism in my own constituency, in the interests of Rome. There were several convent schools in Flintshire, where the children of the Protestant population were attracted by special advantages held out to them. There were also large training colleges for priests, mostly French—some of them expelled Jesuits. Holywell was famous for a medicinal well which was in charge of the Roman Catholics, and it was the shrine for bands of pilgrims who firmly believed that the patron saint, St. Winefride, wrought miraculous cures to bathers in the water. Even the Protestant population believed in the reality of some of these cures, and a skilful Jesuit priest used this vantage ground to the great benefit of his Church. I felt it was needful to put backbone into the Protestant faith, which had successfully thrown off the fetters of Rome in former ages, and to make clear to the average lay mind what corruptions of primitive Christianity underlay the Romish system. I may say that I found about this time great difficulty in getting the English press to admit any matter derogatory to Rome. It was a universal experience. All the encyclicals and utterances of the Pope were published with great respect, such as his appeal to the British people, made about this time, to return to their allegiance to the See of St. Peter ; but Protestant communications were generally rejected, or treated

[1] "At present," says Mr. Walter Walsh in his *Secret History of the Oxford Movement*, "the Church of England is literally honeycombed with secret societies, all working in the interests of the scheme for the corporate reunion of the Church of England with the Church of Rome." These societies include the Confratern the Blessed Sacrament, with 1,700 clerical members ; the "Society of th Cross" ; and the "Guild of All Souls," with 600 clerical members, the object of which is to introduce requiem masses for the souls of the departed.

contemptuously. I discovered that many of our newspapers had Romish sub-editors, or at least leading pressmen on their staffs. Some of these, I am informed, were trained by a Jesuit college employed to furnish pressmen for English papers. I had the experience of seeing speeches of my own subjected to such revision that any paragraph bearing hardly on Romanism was expurgated, and the innocuous matter served up thus would hardly have hurt a fly!

I resolved to deliver an address on the Roman claims, without intimating it to any one beforehand, as I well knew I should find difficulties besetting my path if it were surmised that such was my intention. It took place at Dyserth, in Flintshire, on one of the many occasions when I took part in laying the foundation of a chapel. The address was widely circulated in North Wales, and stirred up the Protestant feeling of the people; and it led by a process of expansion to the publication of my pamphlet on the "Claims of Rome," which has reached a circulation of 300,000, largely through the agency of Protestant societies. Of this 30,000 in the Welsh language were taken by the Welsh Nonconformist Churches.

This led me into a prolonged and thorough study of the question. I had previously to this read nearly all Froude's voluminous historical writings, including his *Erasmus* and *Council of Trent*; also Wylie's *History of the Reformation*, and Hill Burton's *History of Scotland*, covering the Reformation and Covenanting periods, and I added to this Dr. Salmon's admirable book on *The Infallible Church*, the latest and the best book on the claims of Rome I have met with. I also read a second time that remarkable book *The Pope and Council*, by Janus, believed to be the work of two eminent Roman Catholic professors of the school of Döllinger. My pamphlet was vehemently attacked by clever Jesuit controversialists, who abound in Britain, and I took the utmost pains to verify all my facts and quotations, even employing a reader at the British Museum to transcribe the originals of some of the Papal bulls and rescripts, the authenticity of which had been called in question. I furnished a very copious appendix of quotations from undeniable authorities—most of them Romans themselves—so as to put the main facts beyond question. I have read many of the replies to my pamphlet, and can truly say that they are in the main mostly plausible subterfuges. Rome relies upon ignorance and bold assertion. The policy that built up her politi-

cal claims upon the forged Decretals of Isidore—never confessed or atoned for—holds good to this day. Any weapon is lawful that is employed for Mother Church, and there seems a strange decay of the sentiment of truth whenever the mind comes under the sway of that baleful system.

They alone who have trodden the thorny path of religious controversy know what toil it involves; and for years I was involved in laborious correspondence on this and its cognate question—Anglican ritualism. Most of my recess this autumn was so spent. I may here state that my speeches and addresses on Ritualism and other religious questions in the past few years have circulated to about 700,000, or, including "The Claims of Rome," a million in all on these and germane subjects, besides a circulation of much more than this on social, political and economic subjects during the previous thirty years.

We had a very hot dry season this summer. For several years we suffered from the great heat in July and August. Committee work in these months was exceedingly trying. I once sat three weeks on a Committee in July with the thermometer at 85°. We sat five hours a day for five days a week. It had something to do with the illness which finally prostrated me.

I have omitted to mention that a highly controversial Act was passed by the Government this Session—the Agricultural Land Rating Act, which threw half the rates of Agricultural Land on the Exchequer, on the plea that agriculture was so depressed that farmers needed special help. We contended that the help would ultimately go to the landlord, not the farmer.

I think this is being found out now. It is the total outgoing from the farm that a tenant feels, and if rates and taxes be lessened, he can be made through competition to pay more rent. I still think, as I did then, that there is no claim to relieve rural rates at the expense of the exchequer, which does not apply still more to city rates, which are far higher and often paid with even greater difficulty.

I was glad to get away from London on August 8, and Parliament rose on the 16th. The feeling was general that the Government had suffered a serious loss of prestige.

CHAPTER XL

Third Visit to America

I CARRIED out this autumn (1896) a trip to America I had long projected, in order to introduce my son to American life under favourable auspices. I had derived so much benefit from my first trip in 1860 that I wished him to form an acquaintance with that great and growing country before settling down to business in Liverpool.

We started by the *Umbria* on October 3 and, after a rather rough passage, reached New York on October 10. Thirty years had elapsed since my previous visit, and I was struck with the enormous growth of New York and the abounding evidence of wealth and prosperity. The upper part of Fifth Avenue and thence to the Central Park is truly a city of palaces, eclipsing Belgravia or any part of Paris or Berlin. Such an accumulation of wealth has never been gathered in one spot before. You see scores of mansions of multi-millionaires. Fortunes of five or ten millions sterling were no longer spoken of as remarkable, so many far exceeded those limits! The hotels had grown into palaces. The "Waldorf," "Manhattan," and others exceeded in splendour and costliness anything I have seen in Europe.

Yet we found on this trip to America extraordinary social bitterness and discontent. It was a time of great depression in trade. Prices were very low. The Western farmers were deeply in debt to the East; their farms were mortgaged up to the hilt, and a wild movement had arisen for the free coinage of silver so that debts might be paid in a depreciated currency. It was the echo of the bimetallic controversy we had so long carried on in Europe, but in place of being on the honest lines of an international arrangement which would have kept gold and silver all the world over at the ratio agreed upon, it was advocated merely as an American arrangement so that debts might be defrayed in cheap

silver that had been contracted in dear gold. It was, in fact, partial repudiation, or a species of Socialism.

This was the year of the Presidential election, and we were in the midst of it all the time we were in the States, and had ample opportunities for studying the condition of the country. More anxiety was felt than at any time since the famous election of Lincoln, which heralded the Civil War. Many Americans expressed to us the fear that a social convulsion was approaching, and that blood would be shed. We found in all the cities we visited crowds of unemployed people, especially in Chicago; sectional and social bitterness had there reached its acme under the lead of Governor Altgeld, a German of extreme socialistic proclivities. The candidates for office were McKinley (Republican) and Bryan (Democrat), and Altgeld was closely associated with Bryan, though much more advanced in his programme. The chief cause of this social bitterness was the enormous growth of trusts or syndicates, or what the Americans called "combines." By means of these, private traders had almost been eliminated from some of the principal industries of the country, and huge fortunes were accumulated by a small group of daring and sometimes unscrupulous capitalists. All this discontent grouped itself round Bryan, and gave him extraordinary popularity, especially in the Western States. We met several of the leading citizens of America and made a tour extending to Canada, Chicago, Washington, Charleston, New Orleans, and back to New York, and took passage home by the *Lucania* towards the end of November. We saw the beautiful effects of the fall foliage, especially on the Hudson and Lake Champlain, but early winter storms soon stripped the trees of their gay colouring, and we did not get such glowing impressions as I did on another trip three years after, when the golden hues of the late autumn were a wonder of glory and beauty. I need not enter into much detail of this trip as I penned some articles to the press, which I subjoin. These fully record my impressions of the great problems submitted to America, and which are sure to recur again, perhaps in aggravated form. A spell of wonderful prosperity has abated the Socialistic uprising against trusts and syndicates, but it may safely be predicted that when the reaction comes, as it certainly will ere long, the outcry against the abuse of capital will be loud and alarming.

Two incidents I may mention. On our journey to New Orleans our train stopped some hours in the night time in a desolate place,

and we found next morning that a small trestle bridge had been partially burned by sparks from a previous train. Unknown to the passengers this bridge was repaired in the night-time by machinists who were on board the train, and we passed over it all right in the early morning. The custom is to carry by each train the tools required for such emergencies. We reached New Orleans in time to attend Dr. Palmer's Presbyterian Church on Sunday morning—the same in which I used to sit thirty-six years before. The old man eloquent, now seventy-nine, preached a most able sermon an hour long, without notes! He was looked upon as the first Presbyterian clergyman in the Southern States. He was a strong upholder of the Southern Confederacy, and justified its slave institutions, as did nearly all the Southern clergy. He was made chaplain-general of the Southern forces. This question caused a breach between the Northern and Southern Churches which has not been fully healed to this day! Nothing struck me more than the conservative character of the Southern Churches. They resemble those of a century ago, rather than the modern and sometimes sensational developments in Northern cities. I attended a leading Church in Chicago, and heard a discourse on the American flag punctuated by frequent applause. Such a state of things was counted blasphemy by the Southern Churches. One could not but feel an analogy in some ways between the stationary Dutch population of South Africa and the progressive Britons. In both cases incompatibility of ideals had much to do with the respective wars.

Dr. Palmer was the only man living in New Orleans whom I met of those I knew in 1860. It was a depressing experience. I found the city greatly altered. It used to be purely commercial: now it had become quite a manufacturing centre. The great line of cotton-laden steamers which used to crowd the wharf of the Mississippi two or three deep had disappeared. The cotton nearly all came down by rail. The old St. Charles Hotel had disappeared. A new one had been built, but the mosquitoes still remained to torment us, as they did at Charleston, and the heat was excessive. I should mention that on our way south we visited the charming hill station of Ashville, in North Carolina, where we got into a bracing atmosphere, with frost in the mornings. One of the Vanderbilts has built there a palatial mansion, said to be the finest country house in America. I should say it is larger than Chatsworth, but it sadly lacks the rich clothing of old forest trees

and deep green sward that distinguishes English mansions. It seems hardly possible to create in America the true country house. The hot summer climate parches the vegetation, and turns everything to a dull-brown colour, and the great cold of winter makes open-air life impossible then. The British climate gives a charm to a country house which you see in no other land; and the English country house will always be the favourite of the rich and cultured classes, and will draw more and more of the Americans and Colonials to reside here. One great drawback we found on this visit: I allude to the excessive heating of the hotels and railways by steam or hot air. At New York and Montreal our rooms were usually heated to 78° F., with cold frosty weather outside. The dry hot air caused an incessant thirst. Americans usually begin every meal by drinking iced water or iced milk. Nothing can be worse for digestion, and half the people you meet are suffering from dyspepsia. The women age very rapidly. By thirty most of them have lost all colour and have a languid and pallid look. They take hardly any exercise, and some of them never leave the hot unhealthy atmosphere of the hotel all winter. Large numbers of American families live in hotels and boarding houses. It is so difficult to obtain good servants that they are driven to this unwholesome mode of life. I am speaking now of the town populations. The large farming populations live a much hardier and healthier life, but it is a very severe one. In summer they rise by four a.m., and work all day. The women wear themselves out by incessant labour. One cannot but observe that all classes work far harder in America than they do in England or most European countries. It is a great deduction from wealth and prosperity that human life is needlessly toilsome and that it wears out much sooner than with us. Most Americans are old worn-out men at sixty, and their wives at fifty. You seldom see the fresh well-preserved old persons you frequently meet in Britain at seventy, or even seventy-five to eighty. I am told such are found in rural life in America, but I have seldom met them.

Before leaving New York my friend, Mr. Hentz, gave us a dinner at the Manhattan Club, the rendezvous of the Democratic party. He invited the leaders of that party to meet us. We all made short speeches: among others Dr. Lyman Abbott, successor to Henry Ward Beecher in Plymouth Church, old Abraham Hewitt, ex-Mayor of New York, etc. I took occasion to impress upon them the importance of revising the histories of the War of

Independence. I had collected twenty or thirty school history books in which the incidents of the war were treated as the Dutch in the Transvaal would to-day deal with the South African War. They all admitted that the histories were obsolete, and should be rewritten. These have done much to foster ill-will towards the mother country. I also sent an address on the subject to the leading American newspapers, showing how differently we treated the same subject. It led to a vigorous discussion, and I believe that changes have been made. The leading Boston publisher of school books informed me some years ago that he was having these histories re-written.

I now subjoin the articles I wrote for the Press on this visit :—

I.

AFTER a long interval, I had the opportunity this autumn of revisiting the United States and witnessing the crisis of the Presidential election. Few of us in England realized the serious nature of the issues that were then decided, or knew how near this great Republic was to a social convulsion.

Wherever I went, for some weeks before the election, I found a feeling of great anxiety. Many Americans told me that the issues raised were as far reaching as in their great Civil War, and the result was awaited with almost as much apprehension as was the election of Lincoln in 1860. It was not merely a question between gold and silver as the standard of value. It was whether contracts should be repudiated or faithfully observed ; it was whether the wedge of Communism or Socialism should be inserted into the delicate framework of trade and commerce ; it was whether the constitution of the United States should be preserved unimpaired, or whether a far-reaching revolution should be inaugurated by tampering with the authority of the Supreme Court at Washington. This court occupies the pre-eminent position of being sole judge of the constitutionality of any law. It can veto any act of Congress which it regards as illegal. It is, indeed, the mainspring of the constitutional machinery, and if it were paralyzed it might be doubted whether the Federal Republic of the United States could permanently hold together.

Now, it was the main object of the party of Bryan to impair the independence of the Supreme Court by submitting it to popular election at short intervals. It was to be no longer a bulwark of law and order, but the ephemeral expression of the *popularis aura*. The demagogue was to replace the statesman ; the gusts of popular feeling the solid guarantees for good government designed by Washington and Hamilton.

This was in substance the issue raised at the recent election. Every conceivable bribe was offered to the most needy part of the population ; every effort was made to stir up sectional and class animosity.

The West was set against the East; the working classes against their employers; America against Britain. Speeches were made which for violence resembled the ravings of French Communists. Governor Altgeld, of Illinois, almost avowed his sympathy with Anarchism. This notorious man has for several years kept Chicago in terror; he apparently sympathized with the rioters who nearly burned down that city two or three years ago. He set at liberty the condemned dynamiters, and used such language that the lowest classes claimed him as an ally. He was the right hand and adviser of Mr. Bryan, and had that well-meaning gentleman been elected as President, he could hardly have done less than put Altgeld into his Cabinet. It would have been like a Government in our country of Keir Hardie as Prime Minister, with Mr. Hyndman as Home Secretary.

It was not to be wondered at that a sigh of relief ascended from multitudes when the news spread of the thorough defeat of Bryan and Altgeld and most of their allies. I was present among the great crowd at Washington which witnessed the election returns thrown on a screen, in Pennsylvania Avenue, and as the evidence accumulated that McKinley was returned it was easy to discern a feeling of deep satisfaction.

Not that Great Britain has much reason to be satisfied; for the Republican Party are pledged to extreme theories of Protection; yet in a contest where the dominant issues were honour against dishonour, honesty against dishonesty, who would wish the result to be other than it was? Viewed broadly, the triumph of McKinley was a triumph for the principle of self-government. It was a vote of confidence in the sturdy good sense and honesty of the Anglo-Saxon people. One could not but be struck with the marked ability with which the Press carried on the controversy; it was almost unanimous in the Eastern States for sound money, and its arguments were in the main addressed to the moral sense of the community. One could not but feel what a splendid education self-government is to a people. All sorts of difficult monetary and economical questions were discussed for months with an avidity which was marvellous. In our hotel at Chicago, the Palmer House, a crowd filled the huge entrance-hall day after day, discussing with never-ceasing interest the intricacies of the "Silver Question," and I must add that I saw nothing but good humour and urbanity in their proceedings. At the same time, it is only too apparent that Socialism and Anarchism have gained an alarming hold on many of the American cities, and in none more than in Chicago. And on this point I would like to offer some observations.

One thing that has struck me forcibly is the immense increase of the foreign element in the United States as compared with what I saw there thirty years ago. I mean by "foreign" the non-English speaking emigrants. In some of the cities it so predominates that it is quite an exception to meet a man in the street who can speak English fluently, or even intelligibly. In casual conversation you constantly run against foreigners—in this sense, that they can only utter a few English words with a foreign accent. In Chicago, New

York and other great cities, the true American element is overwhelmed by these foreign masses. Prodigious numbers of emigrants come from all parts of Europe, and from countries which contributed scarcely any quota fifty or even forty years ago. Italians, Hungarians, Bohemians, Russian Jews and other races that have no affinity whatever with the Anglo-Saxon people, occupy whole quarters of the great American cities. I do not refer to Germans, the most numerous of all, for they more readily assimilate with the English-speaking race, and in one or two generations almost blend with it; but the less civilized races from Central and Southern Europe are pouring in like a flood, and they are the cause of most of the Anarchism which now infests America. Among them there is little respect for American institutions; as regards religion many of them are Atheists, and where this is not the case they are usually Roman Catholics of a very ignorant type. There is not the remotest affinity between them and the Puritans who founded New England, or the Cavaliers who founded Virginia and the Carolinas. It will take a long time before their descendants can be absorbed into the American Republic. They constitute big patches of darkness in this land of light and liberty; huge sun-spots on the bright disc of the great Republic.

The old American stock, descended from Colonial times, is still the predominant element of American society. It largely controls the industrial enterprises, and mainly fills the Protestant pulpit, and in times of crisis it asserts its authority; but in mere voting power it is quite swamped in many parts of the United States. It will need very careful piloting of the ship of State to avoid disaster from this cause. No such experiment has ever been made before in the world's history.

Nations have often been overrun and subdued by foreign invaders, who settled on the soil and gradually amalgamated with the vanquished race; but in the United States we see the peaceable formation of a huge nation out of a mass of incongruous elements. We see at least half-a-dozen nationalities, divided by racial antipathies by religious animosities, by memories of bitter wars and persecutions, all living together with equal rights, yet with incompatible ideals, and oftentimes with mutual repulsion. Can this incongruous mass be fused into a unified people, or will the strands of diverse language, race and religion fatally weaken the cable which holds the ship of State to its moorings?

Undoubtedly the greatest unifying influence is the splendid system of national education. The public school of America is the nursery of the nation. No expense is spared to perfect the education of the country. No finer sight can be seen than the conduct of a great "public school." The most inspiring sight I witnessed was the vast Normal Institution of New York for the training of teachers. There I saw 2,300 young women assembled in one room, with their professors, under their admirable president, Dr. Hunter, to commence the exercises of the day by a hymn and reading of a chapter of the Bible, followed by literary exercises. These young ladies—and they should

be so styled, for their refinement and culture were very striking—pass through a course of four or five years' college training, including practice in a large elementary school attached to the institution, and are turned out at twenty or twenty-one highly accomplished teachers. To them is confided the moulding of the mind and character of the nondescript child population of New York, a city which contains more Hebrews than any other in the world, more Irish by far than Dublin, more Germans than perhaps any city except Berlin or Vienna, with great masses of Italians, Bohemians, Poles, Hungarians, etc.

Except for the post of head master, nearly all the teaching staff are females, and such are the culture and skill of these teachers that with rare exceptions they maintain excellent order and discipline in their schools, and give to the children at least the rudiments of good citizenship and sound morality. Positive dogmatic religion is not taught, nor could be among such a heterogeneous population; but some portion of Scripture is read, and there is a true and real recognition of God and of His law. The schools, while not distinctively religious, are far from being purely secular, and they fairly meet the peculiar difficulties of the United States. American policy has always strongly discouraged separate denominational education; but as each State deals with its own education, there is considerable variety of treatment, and one can hardly make sweeping statements on this subject without liability to error. It is clear that the future of the United States, as a prosperous and unified nation, depends very much upon maintaining a common system of education and a common language taught to the mass of the people.

II.

NEXT to the foreign element, in point of national danger, is the creation of prodigious fortunes by means of "trusts" or "syndicates." Nothing strikes one more in the United States than the growth of a bitter and Socialistic feeling against capital on account of the abuse of its powers by means of these unwholesome combinations. Never in the world's history have been witnessed such accumulations of capital in single hands as we see in America to-day. Fortunes of ten to fifty millions of dollars (two to ten millions sterling) are so common that little is thought of them, and quite a number of capitalists are reputed to be worth $100,000,000 or over, say £20,000,000 sterling or more. Fortunes of even $200,000,000 are now believed to exist, say £40,000,000 sterling, and I was informed that one of these capitalists had an income last year of $30,000,000, say £6,000,000 sterling[1] These gigantic fortunes would be dangerous enough if earned by individual industry, but they are far more objectionable when earned by methods which seem to most men unfair and sometimes almost fraudulent.

One of the most common abuses is to construct immense trusts,

[1] Mr. Carnegie's capital before he had depleted it by his princely bequests, was put, I think, at 50 millions sterling!

or combinations, to control entire trades, such as the Standard Oil Company,[1] the Sugar Trust, e c. These syndicates too often deliberately destroy all private competitors by opening stores alongs de of them and underselling them until they are ruined. Through dread of this treatment most small dealers are compelled to sell their businesses to the trust, and become their salaried managers. Then, when private competition is destroyed, the price is raised to a point that yields a gigantic profit. This process is greatly facilitated by the high protective tariff, which practically shuts out foreign competition. It would be very difficult to carry out such a system in England, as supplies would pour in at once from abroad if prices were raised at home; but in the United States there is practically little foreign competition. The management of the vast railway property of the country is also very much in the hands of "pools" or "syndicates," or great family combinations; and methods are sometimes adopted to deceive the public which are scarcely distinguishable from fraud. Of course there are many honourable exceptions, but, speaking broadly, capital uses its advantages with less scruple in the United States than in European countries, and appears to be less amenable to the moral law or to public opinion. It is replied to this, that most of the gigantic capitalists have raised themselves from poverty to wealth in a land of liberty, where all start with equal chances. This does not fully satisfy the moral sense of the community. These self-made rich men are often more devoid of a cultivated conscience just because they have known no life except intense competition for wealth. They have not the many refining influences which accompany ancestral wealth, or the sense of social responsibility which exists in old societies. Men like the late Jay Gould are a peculiarly American creation; but South Africa is apparently destined to run America very hard in the production of unprincipled millionaires. No one can doubt that the excessive contrast between wealth and poverty is one of the chief dangers of the modern world, and where reverence and respect for social position are almost unknown the danger is immensely increased. Hence there is in the United States an alarming growth of Anarchism of a bitter type. Attacks on the lives of millionaires are becoming more common, and it is alleged that some of them are constantly guarded by detectives, besides adopting other means of defence. As a consequence of this abnormally wealthy class there is a dangerous development of luxury in New York and the larger towns. The modern hotels are more sumptuous than the palaces in Europe, and a vulgar ostentation is sapping the simplicity of Republican life and manners.

Of course these remarks do not touch the great mass of the people; they apply to the rich *parvenus* and their coteries. But these set a false ideal before the eyes of the American people, and contribute to social discontent and impoverished standards of public virtue.

[1] I am assured by a gentleman who is interested in the Standard Oil Company, that it is free from those defects of management which exist in so many of the "Trusts."

All these wealthy trusts and corporations, with rare exceptions, supported McKinley and the Republican Party. They are all deeply interested in Protection, and no doubt this fact supplied a certain basis for giving honest support to Bryan. Had his denunciations been confined to wealthy monopolists and unscrupulous corporations, he would have had a good chance of success; but the schemes he put forward struck at the root of all security for property. The four or five millions of depositors in savings banks, the twelve millions of holders of insurance policies, were all interested in preserving a "sound dollar," and, great as were the interests on the other side, the weight of conservatism overpowered the revolutionary element in society.

But it would be a great mistake to conclude that the reckless abuse of "trusts" and "corporations" is condoned by this election. The time is near at hand when strong action must be taken to limit their powers. It is true that enormous difficulties beset this question, but it is of paramount importance. Ways must be found to curb these illegitimate uses of capital, or a wild outburst of Socialism may wreck the American Republic at no distant date. I have seen it stated that one-half of the entire wealth of the United States is now owned by 4,000 persons. This is utterly unsound and dangerous. The great farming class is the backbone of the country. It is deeply in debt to moneylenders; it pays a usurious rate of interest, often eight per cent., a heavier charge than our farmers pay for rent. The extremely low prices of late years have hardly left a margin for living expenses after paying this exorbitant interest. The struggle of life has been intensely severe in the Western States, and it has developed an unreasoning hostility against the moneyed interest of New York and Great Britain. The demand for the free coinage of silver was the most effective way of fighting the moneyed classes and reducing the weight of the farmers' obligations. It caught like wildfire in a prairie, and swept over the Western States with irresistible force. It also powerfully affected the Southern States, where planters were in much the same position as the Western farmers. Still, it became clear as the discussion proceeded that even more numerous classes were threatened by the proposed change than those which supported the agitation, and for the time being the agitation for free silver is scotched, but not killed. Had international bimetallism been practicable this agitation would not have arisen. Should it afterwards become practicable, the agitation will be laid to rest. It will be a wise policy on the part of McKinley to make earnest efforts for international bimetallism as far as may be practicable, and to this end the question of ratio must be left to a committee of experts. It is impossible to settle an intensely intricate question of monetary science by popular agitation. If any real progress is to be made, it must be made by a committee of scientific monetary experts, and nat ons must sink their preference for special ratios on behalf of some common basis which is adapted to the changed condition of the precious metals both as regards quantity and cost of production. If this is found

to be impracticable, I fear international bimetallism must be relegated to the Greek kalends. However, this question is not so urgent as legislation for curbing the power of "trusts" or "syndicates," and I would venture the opinion that if this is not done the time will come when even the just and reasonable use of capital may be harshly interfered with.

Along with this, it appears to a friendly critic that these huge capitals should contribute more than they do to national taxation. The Supreme Court has voted an income-tax unconstitutional. No doubt its decision is according to the letter of the Constitution, but that instrument itself provides for constitutional amendments. True, these can only be carried when there is a very general consensus of public opinion. There are impediments wisely thrown in the way of sudden innovations, but these impediments are not immovable. They were overcome when the famous amendment was passed prohibiting slavery, and they can be overcome again when a cause of extreme urgency arises.

Public policy in America should be directed against the perpetuation of gigantic fortunes either by some limitations on the right of bequest or by graduated income-tax and death duties. The State should discourage those dangerous aggregations of capital. In doing so, it would really safeguard the true interests of private property.

It would not be just to leave this subject without remarking on the great liberality of some of the "multi-millionaires" in America. The donations of some of them to public objects are princely. Gifts of a million of dollars (£200,000) are so common that they attract little attention. The Chicago University has been founded in the main by the munificent gifts of Mr. Rockefeller, the president of the Standard Oil Trust. He has contributed, if I am not misinformed, some seven or eight millions of dollars to this noble institution. This University, as if under the magic of Aladdin's lamp, has in four years burst into splendid activity. It possesses several noble buildings and well-endowed chairs, and is rapidly forming a staff of illustrious teachers. Cornell University is another example of sudden creation by munificent endowments, and many others are in process of formation.

The Vanderbilt family has done much for New York, and Mr. Seth Low,[1] an honoured name in New York, has given a million dollars to Columbia University, of which he is president.

A sense of public duty is growing among the rich men of the United States, and just as they use their accumulated wealth for noble ends will social bitterness diminish.

Truth requires it to be said that philanthropists abound in America, and some of them are of a supremely noble type, as they give not only their wealth but their time and abilities to public ends. Still, all

[1] He was elected Mayor of New York in the late contest in which the corrupt power of Tammany Hall was broken—an omen of better times for that great community of 3½ millions of people.

this does not touch the question of curbing the cruel and unscrupulous modes by which huge wealth is too often acquired.

There is one subject on which I must add a few words. I refer to the feelings entertained in the United States towards Great Britain. We are painfully aware of the extraordinary outburst of irritation which occurred at this time last year (1895) on the Venezuela question. I am glad to say that this special cause of illfeeling has quite died out. I saw scarcely an allusion to it all the time I was in America. Most Americans now try to explain it away, and say that President Cleveland did not really mean to convey a threat of war. Some hold that the warlike message was only a political device to strengthen his Party. It may be doubted whether these explanations are adequate. Trumpery as the matter was, it gave an outlet for a vast amount of pent-up illfeeling against Great Britain. As often happens both with nations and individuals, a good hearty scolding clears the air. The Americans blew off their steam a year ago, and seem in a much more amiable mood now. I understand that not only is this special question practically closed, but a general treaty of arbitration is likely to be concluded in the near future.

To this I attach enormous importance. It meets the approval of all good men in America, and it will set an example which is almost sure to spread among other nations, with the happiest results. My intercourse with Americans has convinced me that underneath the friction and irritation which too often appear on the surface there is true affection for the old country on the part of many. The old colonial stock, which preponderates in the Southern States and is largely spread in the Eastern States, are proud of speaking of England as the mother country. Most powerful ties of religion and literature bind them together; but it is equally true that the vast Irish and German element is not friendly; and the great body of mixed nationalities from Central and Southern Europe can easily be inflamed against a country whose ideals of life are quite alien to theirs. Party politicians will go great lengths to buy votes, and too many newspapers grasp at any weapon that will make a sensation. The Press is a very mixed power in the United States. While there are some most able and soundly-written papers, there are many which do not scruple to increase their circulation by appealing to poor and unworthy prejudices.

There is, unfortunately, one cause which underlies much of this irritation. The history books taught in the public schools too often give the children of America the impression that the main events in human history are the American War of Independence, concluded in 1783, and the war with Great Britain of 1812–14. It need not be added that Great Britain appears in those histories always in the wrong, and the Americans always in the right. There is not pains taken to show that the best men in England protested against the of George III. and Lord North, and that the British natio esteems George Washington as much as do the people of Am is not explained that the Britain of last century was go

the aristocracy, and that the Britain of to-day repudiates the fatal policy of the eighteenth century as much as do the citizens of the United States. These truths gradually become clear to all educated Americans, especially to those who visit Europe. But the children of the ignorant foreign population get no correcting education afterwards. The newspapers they read perpetuate these prejudices, and there is consequently created a permanent mass of ill-feeling against Great Britain. I spoke of this to several Americans, who felt the force of it, and I think the time has come when this subject might be approached by the best men and women of the United States as they approached the subject of arbitration. It must be apparent to all right-thinking people that it is un-Christian to sow seeds of enmity in the minds of the young against other nations, especially when closely allied in blood and religion. And I am in hopes that the Churches in America will before long take this view themselves.

I would add that the statesmen of Great Britain must never make the mistake of ignoring the intense sensitiveness of Americans to the Monroe doctrine. It may appear to us unreasonable to extend it to South America, but the fact exists, and it is better to accept it as one does the laws of nature, and adapt our policy to it. I do not despair of keeping permanent peace and even friendliness between the English-speaking nations. The United States already possesses prodigious power and resources; it has seventy millions[1] of people now, and will soon have a hundred millions, and perhaps double that enormous population before the end of next century. It needs no seer to foretell that the future of the great British Empire is bound up with the maintenance of friendly relations with the United States. There is a large and influential element in America most anxious to bring this about, and our wisdom is to do all we can to strengthen its hands, and to take little notice of the occasional outbursts of spleen which are sure to recur from time to time among the heterogeneous masses which find a home on the North American continent.

III.

THE previous part of this brochure was penned in America: the remainder in England. One can judge best of a range of mountains from a distance, and the great features of America are seen best when the traveller returns to this side of the Atlantic.

The predominant impression that remains on one's mind is the *hugeness* of the United States and the splendour of its cities. It is continental in size, some thirty times the area of Great Britain; and this vast expanse is filling up with incredible rapidity, and developing into one of the most energetic nations on the face of the earth. One does not realize the hugeness of the United States until one attempts to survey it, but after travelling by day and night for several thousand miles, and perceiving by the map that one has only touched the rim of the country, you feel overpowered by its vastness. But there are other vast countries besides the United States: the British Empire

[1] Seventy-six millions by last census.

covers double or treble the space; so does Russia in Europe and Asia. The distinguishing feature of the United States is the prodigious energy it has displayed; its seventy millions create more wealth annually than the seven hundred millions of Russia, India, and China combined. What is the cause of this astonishing energy? A stimulating climate has something to do with it; the subjugation of the wilderness evoked extraordinary inventive genius; democracy gave individual energy the freest scope; there were no traditional or aristocratic ideals to look up to; success in the struggle of life was the chief passport to social distinction; the brain of the country was given to industrial development as has never happened before in human history. It is hardly realized how great a proportion of the brain power in old countries is intercepted by traditional etiquette. Multitudes of what are called "the upper classes" vegetate in comparative idleness in all European countries; many follow literature and art in a *dilettante* sort of way; many follow the military profession as being more gentlemanly (?); multitudes still regard trade and commerce as essentially plebeian. These classes, though not a large part of the nation, yet possess great influence as setting the fashion. In Britain, in France and Germany, most men in business aspire to "retire" at some time if moderately successful, and as a matter of fact many do so. The retired merchant or manufacturer enjoys more consideration in what are called the "upper circles" than an active man of business. These feelings deeply permeate all old countries, especially where an aristocracy prevails, and the effect is to withdraw from active industry much of the wealth and energy of the community. Nothing of the kind exists in America. There the pursuit of commerce is the engrossing occupation from youth to age; a "retired" capitalist is almost unknown; some of the hardest workers in the United States are men who have accumulated gigantic fortunes. They bring the trained intelligence of a lifetime to bear on industrial problems. It is not so much greed of wealth as insatiable energy that holds them at the oar till they drop into the grave. The main standard of measurement in America is the dollar; it measures not merely material, but mental, moral, and even religious products. A great man is described by the number of dollars he is worth; a great mansion or a fine cathedral by the dollars it cost: a great artist, a great author, or a great preacher by the income he can earn. The standard that appeals to the popular imagination is mainly one of dollars. It is not that worship or admiration always follows wealth—far from it; the use of wealth and the way it is acquired count for much. The public judge shrewdly of character, and make a just distinction between Jay Goulds and George Peabodys; yet the standard of measurement is mainly a pecuniary one, and this arises from the intense industrial energy, which has absorbed nine-tenths of the mental fibre of the country. No doubt it has produced a civilization which is too materialistic, which lacks richness of colouring and picturesque variety; but it also lacks that snobbishness and hollow conventionality that are the curse of aristocratic communities.

The American says what he thinks as a matter of course, and puts on no varnish of conventional untruth, and in this respect he is more manly than the shoddy imitators of what is called "good society."

The absence of conventionality is even more perceptible in American women. They see things as they are, and form truer judgments on right and wrong than their sisters in Europe. Conventional and insincere judgments are the curse of fashionable society all the world over. There is less of it in America than in this country, or anywhere in Europe.

Far more avenues of employment are open to educated women in America than here. In many colleges they study and graduate on equal terms with men; they almost engross the teaching profession in the common schools; they do a great part of the work of the Post Office and Telegraph departments; they furnish a large part of the clerks in public offices and in private firms; they are frequently farmers, sometimes lawyers, doctors, and even barristers. I may remark that there is no technical difference between solicitors and barristers in America; any lawyer can plead before the courts if he chooses. The sentiment of America favours giving equal opportunities to every one, and on the whole it works well.

I may add that all the preceding observations, both in this and the former letters, apply much more to the Northern and Western States than to the Southern. In the latter, partly from climate, partly as a relic of slavery, there is much less energy and progress than in the other sections of the Union. Yet the change since the war is very marked; industries of all kinds have sprung up, largely the product of Northern capital, and the South, which was once exclusively a planting and agricultural community, has now great industrial centres like Atlanta, Birmingham and Chatanooga. The white and the coloured population, so far as I could judge, live amicably together, though there are lamentable exceptions; the negroes do most of the manual labour, and receive fair wages. Many of them rent small farms from the old Southern planters, and raise fair crops of corn and cotton. I could see hardly any social antipathy: both races travelled together in the railway and tramcars, and I found the manners of the coloured population generally civil and obliging. It is true that occasionally dreadful crimes are perpetrated, and terrible vengeance is taken by the white population. There are parts of the South, I am informed, where the negroes are relapsing into a savage state, but it is not so in the centres of population; there Christianity is doing its civilizing work among a race which is singularly open to religious impressions, and one of the most interesting sights I witnessed in the South was a negro congregation of 1,500 to 2,000 persons in Wilmington. The service was conducted with a spirit of devotion that is too often absent in so-called fashionable churches. It is true that the vices engendered by slavery are hard to eradicate, but progress is being made on right lines both among the white and coloured population, and any idea of deporting the negroes to Africa is the veriest moonshine.

The difficulties of what is called the negro problem are not greater than those of the Western problem. The States west of the Mississippi were the home of Bryanism, and of all kinds of socialistic doctrines. Those States now contain about two-sevenths of the population; in fifty years they will probably contain one-half. The area west of the Mississippi is twice as large as that east of it; into this is pouring a mixed multitude of nationalities, and it is developing a type very unlike the Anglo-Saxon population of the East. The Roman Catholic element is far stronger in the West than in the East. The variety of faiths and of no faiths is greater than in the older States. Mormonism is spreading very rapidly, though polygamy is now interdicted, and there is growing up in the West a feeling of hostility to the habits and ideas of the Eastern people. This hostility revealed itself in a way that was alarming in the last election, and if there is danger to the Union in the remote future, it will come from that quarter rather than from the South.

Many of the best men in the United States regard the future with great anxiety. No one has put these difficult problems more clearly than Dr. Josiah Strong, of New York, in his two books entitled *Our Country*, and *The New Era*.

Thoughtful Americans of the best type regard with grave anxiety the decline of religion in many parts of the country, especially in mixed populations like that of Chicago. It is only too obvious that this huge agglomeration of mingled peoples can only be held together in peacable union by a strong moral force, and I know of no power that can generate such a force except the religion of Jesus Christ. Yet my predominant feeling is one of hopefulness for the great Republic of North America. It has overcome great perils in the past, and I trust and believe it will surmount the dangers of the future.

CHAPTER XLI

The Session of 1897—My Motion on Disestablishment—Crete—The Indian Famine—The Christian Endeavour Society—The Diamond Jubilee—Death of Ernest Balfour—Last Visit to Mr. Gladstone.

PARLIAMENT met on January 19, and I succeeded in drawing the first place in the ballot for February 9 on the subject of the Disestablishment of the Church of England both in England and Wales.

I never undertook anything that was more unpopular. All the Liberal leaders were opposed to it, and made me feel it so in a manner that was very trying, and of course it was resented by the whole Conservative party. I was well aware that as a politician it was mere folly to raise such a question. None had touched it since Mr. Miall in 1873, and the cause had greatly gone down in the country. The impelling motive that urged me to this course was the apparent impossibility of rousing the country to the stealthy Romanizing of the Church except by a motion of this kind. There was no opening in the ordinary course of Parliament for debates on Church doctrine or polity. It was only by raising an abstract question like this on a private member's motion that one could bring oneself into order to discuss the growth of Ritualism. I therefore resolved to brave the unpopularity, and attempt what most people thought to be a Quixotic enterprise.

A sharp attack of illness at the beginning of the Session laid me up at my hotel, but I recovered in time to bring on my motion of February 9. All our own front bench ostentatiously absented themselves. The Whips on both sides agreed to treat it as a *brutum fulmen*. I laid the stress of my argument on the Erastian side of the case, showing how utterly incompatible was allegiance to the Spiritual Head of the Church with the State machinery for the election of bishops, the rights of patrons, the sale of advowsons,

and the supremacy of the Civil courts. This ground I travelled over so fully in my address a year or two before—most of which is incorporated in this work—that I forbear to repeat the argument. I then turned to the Romanizing process that was going on in the Church, and dealt with it as follows :—

A revolution has taken place in the last fifty years, which has practically stamped out the Protestant character of the Church in most of the parishes of the land. Doctrines are taught and ceremonies are practised which are in absolute contradiction to the Thirty-Nine Articles which every clergyman has solemnly subscribed ; those very practices which the Prayer-book stigmatises as " blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits " are taught in thousands of pulpits. The greater part of the clergy repudiate the word Protestant ; notwithstanding that the Coronation Oath binds the Sovereign of this country, who is by law the Supreme Governor of the Church, to the maintenance of the " Protestant Reformed Religion." I will read to the House the formula employed on this occasion. The Archbishop says :—

" Will you to the utmost of your power maintain the laws of God, the true profession of the Gospel, and the Protestant Reformed Religion established by law ? " The Sovereign answers, " All this I promise to do," and then takes a solemn oath to that effect. In addition to this the Sovereign also subscribes the following declaration against Transubstantiation :—

" I, Victoria, do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess and testify and declare that I do believe that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is not any Transubstantiation of the Elements of Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever, and that the Invocation or Adoration of the Virgin Mary or any other Saint, and the Sacrifice of the Mass, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous. And I do solemnly, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, that I do make this declaration and every part thereof in the plain and ordinary sense of the words read unto me, *as they are commonly understood by English Protestants without any Evasion, Equivocation*, or mental Reservation, and without any dispensation already granted me for this purpose by the Pope, or any other authority or person whatsoever, or without any hope of any such dispensation from any person or authority whatsoever, or without thinking that I am or can be acquitted before God or man, or absolved of this declaration or any part thereof, although the Pope or any other person or persons or power whatsoever shall dispense with or annul the same or declare that it was null and void from its beginning."

No historian will deny that the Church settlement in the time of Elizabeth was a Protestant settlement, yet now a great part of the clergy disown the Reformation of the sixteenth century, and eagerly long after reunion with Rome. In a great many Anglican churches the service is now practically Roman. We see the confessional set up,

and the Mass, and the invocation of saints, and prayers for the dead, and practices which are forbidden by the law of the Church, yet all observed without let or hindrance by most of the Bishops.

What Cardinal Vaughan says.

Lest any one should think that I am exaggerating, permit me to quote from Cardinal Vaughan :—

"The doctrines of the Catholic Church, which had been rejected and condemned as being blasphemous, superstitious, and fond inventions, have been re-examined and taken back, one by one, until the Thirty-nine Articles have been banished and buried as a rule of faith. The real presence, the sacrifice of the Mass, offered for the living and the dead—sometimes even in Latin—not infrequent reservation of the sacrament, regular auricular confession, extreme unction, Purgatory, prayers for the dead, devotions to Our Lady, to her immaculate conception, the use of the rosary and the invocation of saints, are doctrines taught and accepted with a growing desire and relish for them in the Church of England. A celibate clergy, the institution of monks and nuns under vows, retreats for the clergy, missions for the people, fasting and other penitential exercises—candles, lamps, incense, crucifixes, images of the Blessed Virgin, and the saints held in honour, stations of the cross, cassocks, cottas, Roman collars, birettas, copes, dalmatics, vestments, mitres, croziers, the adoption of an ornate Catholic ritual, and now recently an elaborate display of the whole ceremonial of the Catholic Pontifical—all this speaks of a change and a movement towards the Church that would have appeared absolutely incredible at the beginning of this century. And what is still more remarkable is that the movement has been stronger than the rankest Protestantism, stronger than the Bishops, stronger than the lawyers and Legislature. A spasmodic protest, a useless prosecution, a delphic judgment, and the movement continues and spreads, lodging itself in Anglican homes and convents, in schools, churches, and even cathedrals, until it is rapidly covering the country."

These statements of the Cardinal are perhaps exaggerated, but no one denies they are very largely true, and in my opinion they are ominous of great danger to the nation. In such an assembly as this we cannot enter into theological argument, but this at least is relevant to the case : the Church of England as by law established is a Protestant Church ; her Articles denounce in the strongest terms the doctrines and practices of Rome ; she holds her vast national endowments on these conditions ; she cannot alter a line of her Articles and formularies without the consent of Parliament ; yet she acts as if she could ignore the Protestant Reformation, in spite of Parliament, and in spite of the great majority of her own laity.

The Church has broken its contract.

The position to which we have come is this. We have a national Church, enjoying an enormous revenue and immense prestige from its union with the State. It holds its property and its privileges on con-

dition of observing its side of the contract. Yet it has broken it in the most flagrant manner. I ask where is redress to be found ? I know of no place but the High Court of Parliament. I know it is a most unfit Court to decide cases of theology ; but this is one of the consequences of having an Established Church ; the State cannot wash its hands of it ; it has but two courses open to it, either to reform the Church or disestablish it ; either to mend it or end it. I am convinced that the days of reformation by the State have passed away, never to return. This Parliament will never again frame a Confession of Faith ; but there is one thing this Parliament will do, perhaps not to-day or to-morrow—it will refuse to consent to the Romanizing of England, even at the cost of the Church Establishment. I conclude in the words of the late Dean Alford :—

"Whether years or decades of years be taken for the accomplishment of the severance of the Church from the State, however it may be deprecated, and however opposed, accomplished it will certainly be. History has for ages been preparing its way ; God's arm is thrusting it on, and man's power cannot keep it back."

I was ably seconded by Mr. E. J. C. Morton, and then replied to by Mr. Balfour with a touch of disdain, as though the motion was one rather *pour rire* than for earnest debate. It was his cue to stop discussion on a delicate subject in which there was deep feeling among his own party, as subsequent debates soon proved. He closed his speech with these words :—

"I have been dragged, somewhat against my will, into discussion on the merits of the resolution before the House. When I got up I had intended to dismiss them even more summarily than I have done. I beg the House to show its harmony with the sentiments of the country by dismissing speedily and effectually this resolution which has been brought forward to-night. I trust that we shall waste no more time either in discussing the antiquarian tales so dear to the heart of the hon. gentleman, or in following out the prophecies in which he indulged with so much courage ; but we shall by an overwhelming majority, and with no unnecessary delay, show the country that this House of Commons at all events represents their deepest feelings and their strongest convictions, and that it will not tolerate, longer than it can help, even the consideration of a motion which is so diametrically opposed to all their wishes and hopes. I shall not myself move an amendment to this motion, and I shall not suggest to any hon. gentleman that he should do so. Let us meet it in the only way it deserves to be met—by a direct negative, and let it be uttered in no unmistakable tones."

Mr. Carvell Williams, the veteran secretary of the Liberation Society, then gave his view, and Mr. H. Roberts the special Welsh view. No other member spoke from the Tory side, under pressure

from their Whips, and the division was taken; for the motion, 86, against, 204.

I do not in the least regret the action I took. I knew it was irrational in the eyes of the conventional politician, but I broke the ice and prepared the way for most thorough and far-reaching debates a year or two after. No one will ever be a pioneer in the path of reform who is not willing at times to be "sent to Coventry." No one will ever accomplish anything worth doing who is too anxious about his own reputation. The mass of men—even good men—will never move far from the conventional road. It has often been my lot to press on the public attention unwelcome subjects. It would have been much pleasanter to keep silence; but the "fire in my bones" demanded utterance; and I have usually found that in a few years after, public opinion comes abreast of you, and a host of friends who stood aloof and shook their heads at your rashness, afterwards speak as if they had always been of the same opinion as yourself!

The chief events of the Session were the Education Bill, giving an additional aid grant of 5*s*. per head to the children in Voluntary Schools, with some slight aid to poor Board Schools; as well as the Workmen's Compensation for Accidents Act, which Mr. Chamberlain carried through with conspicuous ability, and which was a great boon to the working-class population. It is true that it has caused much litigation, but it grants a principle of great value to the workers, viz., that the wounded soldiers of industry have a claim to compensation from the industry in which they suffered. So also in case of death the dependants can claim reasonable compensation. It marks a stage in the growing humanity that distinguishes the social evolution of the age. I say God be praised for this.

Much sympathy was felt this year with the sufferings of the Christians of Crete under the abominable Turkish Government; but the Cretans, unlike the Armenians, knew how to defend themselves, and they had the strong sympathy of their kinsmen of Greece. The Great Powers vainly attempted to stop the conflagration, but their mutual jealousies as usual paralysed their action, and war broke out between Turkey and Greece. The contest was too unequal, and when it became clear that Greece would be crushed, intervention was resorted to, which saved the little state, and provided for the autonomy of Crete. The Turkish garrisons were at last withdrawn from the island, and a wonderfully successful government has been set up under Prince George of Greece, who

has ruled so wisely and so well that Europe hears nothing more of Cretan troubles. But there were times when considerable anxiety was felt lest the Powers should quarrel with each other and the Concert break to pieces.

This year, which was brightened by the Diamond Jubilee of our beloved Queen Victoria, was also darkened by a terrible famine in India. One or two years of scarcity and high prices had preceded it, but the rains failed in Western India in 1897, and in many parts, especially in Guzerat, an almost total failure of crops resulted. The Government made gigantic efforts to cope with the distress. At one time it fed about four millions of the population, and private charity to the extent of a million sterling poured in from all parts of the British Empire. In spite of all that could be done, there was great suffering and serious mortality. The districts affected contained 40 or 50 millions of people, and many Native States were equally scourged. I made a strong appeal to Parliament for an Imperial grant in aid of India, which was supported by Sir Henry Fowler. This was not so much because the finances of India were unequal to the strain, for the credit of that country stood high, and it could easily borrow all that was needed; but I thought that a token of Imperial sympathy was very desirable. It was, however, declined, and so was also another appeal I made three years after in the still worse famine of 1900.

I went to Liverpool at the Whitsuntide recess to receive the delegates of the Christian Endeavour Convention, 14,000 in number, which met there, and to act as host to Dr. and Mrs. Clark of America, the founders of the Society. Five of our largest halls were filled daily. The proceedings were deeply interesting. The practical side of Christianity was specially emphasized. The tone of the addresses was very high. This great movement, which has now three millions of adherents, hails from America, where it is most successful. Its annual conventions there sometimes draw 40,000 or 50,000 people and almost overflow the cities where they are held. But it is spreading all over the world. It lays hold of the young at the critical age between youth and manhood, and its motive force in America is the younger generation of the Protestant churches. It is an admirable corrective to ecclesiastical and sacerdotal Christianity, being in its character wholly evangelical and biblical. I afterwards attended the huge Convention in London some years later, held at the Alexandra Palace, but the crowds were almost too great for effective speaking. I formed a very high opinion of

Dr. Clark and his wife, who hold to the Christian Endeavour Society much the same relation that General and Mrs. Booth did to the Salvation Army.

The Diamond Jubilee of our beloved Queen was the great event of the summer. She had in a reign of sixty years gained an astonishing hold on the heart of the nation. I think I may say truly that no Sovereign in English history ever attained such universal esteem as Queen Victoria. This was more conspicuous in her old age. There were times when she was partially misunderstood, as happens to all great characters, but the mists cleared away, and in her old age the noble lineaments of her character stood confessed to all the world. It was then seen how in every national crisis she had instinctively taken the right side, and how she had invariably worked for international peace and amity. But behind all that lay the deep sense of her truly religious life. The fierce light that beats upon a throne had no shadow to cast upon her stainless life. The lines of the Poet Laureate expressed the universal sentiment :—

"Her court was pure ; her life serene ;
God gave her peace ; her land reposed ;
A thousand claims to reverence closed
In her as mother, wife, and queen."

The celebrations were most successful. A lovely day witnessed the Royal procession. The Commons had a stand facing Westminster Bridge, from which we saw the splendid pageant of world-wide contingents from all parts of the huge Empire over which she reigned. The Queen displayed in her strong face a mixture of joy and dignity that became the greatest sovereign in the world, but the predominant expression was sympathy with her beloved subjects. There was no ceremonial on this occasion in Westminster Abbey, only a thanksgiving in the open area of St. Paul's Cathedral. The perfect weather enabled the vast crowds to see the illuminations at night. The Naval Review at Spithead was a great success. Four lines of war ships, each five miles long, proved that Victoria was Queen of the Seas. The Commons had the splendid Cunarder *Campania* put at their disposal. My son accompanied me, and knew almost every vessel by her head-mark. His acquaintance with the Royal Navy was phenomenal. A garden party at Windsor the following Saturday wound up the celebrations. It was a lovely day. The grounds of the Castle were exquisite. The Queen drove

about in a little pony carriage, speaking to several of the members, and making herself most affable. All of us retain a delightful remembrance of that function. No accident marred the festivities; and it may be said that the British Empire, personified by its Sovereign, then reached the zenith of its prosperity. Little did we foresee the dark days that were soon to come upon us!

So far I have set down only the pleasant episodes of the Jubilee, but I cannot refrain from repeating what I have already referred to in the Jubilee of 1887—that a dangerous stimulus was given to national pride. The tone of the press became about this time more boastful and overbearing than at any period in my recollection. One noticed this especially in London. Gratitude to God was supplanted by self-glorification. One saw the same spirit which had prevailed in the United States before their great Civil War, and which had hurried France on to her catastrophe in 1870–1. I often felt uneasy when I read the vaunting speeches and articles that then appeared in profusion. I have great doubts as to the wisdom of these celebrations. Poor human nature cannot resist the temptation to boast. The hand-writing on the wall taught King Belshazzar a lesson which we all need to remember: "Thou hast lifted up thyself against the Lord of Heaven . . . and the God in Whose hand thy breath is, and Whose are all thy ways, hast thou not glorified."

These lines are penned in the sad time that has followed the postponement of King Edward's Coronation. The King's illness shattered for a time all the ceremonial so elaborately prepared. The nation was taught afresh the mutability of human affairs. One cannot but discern a notable change in the national temper as contrasted with 1897. Then it was all exultation; now it is submission and intercession. The press is filled with reports of touching addresses to the Divine Majesty and of earnest prayers for our beloved Sovereign, which happily were heard. The blessed peace in South Africa has left behind it a chastened and thankful spirit. The accent of boastfulness has marvellously disappeared. I cannot but hope that a more fruitful era in our national life has arrived. I believe that the trials have purified the people, at least to the point of making its ear more responsive to the voice divine. Therefore I look more hopefully to our future than I have been able to do for many years past.

This autumn I got away to Orchill early in August. Our dear young friend, Ernest Balfour, was on a visit to my neighbour,

Sir James Bell, of Ardoch. He was the son of my old friend, Alexander Balfour of Liverpool, and was one of the finest athletes at Oxford. He rowed in the eight that won the boatrace against Cambridge, and was as beautiful in character as he was strong in muscle. Yet in two weeks he died of some form of blood-poisoning. My son felt it very much indeed. We were all deeply saddened, and none more than his kind host and hostess, who placed their house at the disposal of his mother, brother and sisters, and aided them in their death struggle with the terrible malady. We laid him to rest at Dawyck, the beautiful country seat of Mrs. Balfour. Most of his Oxford friends were present, and the scene was very touching. The Bishop of Wakefield and several Presbyterian ministers united in the religious rites.

This was rather a wet cold autumn, and I did not get so much benefit as usual from my rest, and I was much troubled in winter with dyspepsia and neuralgia of the stomach. I was also unusually busied with public work in Liverpool and in my constituency. On one of these occasions I paid my last visit to Mr. Gladstone at Hawarden. He looked very old and frail (he was 88), and so did Mrs. Gladstone. I had a presentiment that it was the last time I should see him. The illness from which he died next year was then coming on—necrosis of the upper jaw or the bone of the nose. He was speaking with sadness of the jingo spirit that had arisen in the nation, and of the enormous growth of military expenditure. I said to him that we greatly missed his voice and that of John Bright in the cause of national righteousness. Soon after this Mr. and Mrs. Gladstone went to Cannes, and stayed with Lord Rendel in his beautiful villa there. Lord Rendel was connected with him by marriage, as his daughter was married to one of Mr. Gladstone's sons. The change, however, did him no good, and he came home to die—the following May.

multitude of the lesser agents, people who do not even know or come in contact with the higher officials, and the result is that there is much distress and suffering; and I repeat that there is a danger of the same sort of thing happening now as happened in 1878.

I showed further that in twenty years we had spent about seventy crores (nearly 50 millions sterling) on frontier wars, and that most of our internal difficulties in the government of India sprang from this insatiable monster of military expenditure.

It is true that we were beaten on this occasion by a large majority, but I am glad to say that soon after this an entire change was made in our frontier policy. We retired from Chitral, and assured the tribes that we would respect their independence. Lord Curzon —once an advocate of the forward policy—has become a true friend of peace, and has made excellent arrangements with the Afridis, which have given us some years of peace in this difficult and dangerous region.

My youngest brother, Anthony, died this spring. He had been in poor health for some years, and had retired from the firm and spent some winters abroad. He had fine literary tastes, and quite a remarkable knowledge of English poetry. Had he not been a business man, he might have done something in original work, for he had fine intellectual powers. He was only forty-seven.

I have now to turn to what was my most important Parliamentary work: I refer to my action on the Church question. It had been pressing on me increasingly that unless some action were taken to rouse the British people, the Anglican Church would silently, but completely, be Romanized, and the way would be prepared either for absorption into Rome, or for a tremendous schism, which would shake English society to its foundation. I could not see any way of delivering a blow so effectively as from the floor of Parliament. Yet the difficulties were very great. The rules of the House made it hardly possible to discuss Church questions. The long silence of Parliament had created the impression that the day had passed for ecclesiastical discussions. The signal failure of the Public Worship Regulation Act of 1874 to check Ritualism seemed to prove the futility of legislative action. Besides, no one felt more than I the inappropriateness of discussing religious questions before a body elected for totally different purposes, and containing men of every shade of religious opinion, not to speak of avowed agnostics. My life-long training in the atmosphere of the Free Churches, and in the principles of spiritual independence, made me recoil from asking

the interposition of a secular assembly of politicians in matters of religion.

Yet it was clear that there was no hope of arresting this Rome-ward drift outside Parliament. The bishops had almost ceased to strive against the current: many of them sympathized with it. The ruling powers, both in Church and State, seemed leagued to overthrow the Protestant evangelical character of the National Church. But the broad fact remained, that the great bulk of the laity hated and despised the movement, regarding it as alike un-English and fatal to liberty. But they had no power of self-protection. The patrons could intrude the most advanced Ritualists into parishes against the wish of all the inhabitants. The Protestant service, which had existed for three centuries, was in many cases converted into an imitation of Rome, in spite of angry protests by the congregation, and for the most part the bishops paid no regard to these remonstrances. A state of pent-up indignation existed, which only required an outlet to blaze forth. There was no remedy possible except through Parliament. The legislative machinery of the Church was the creation of Parliament. It had left the laity helpless to protect themselves. They could not move hand or foot without fresh legislation; and so long as this condition of things existed, it seemed right that Free Churchmen like myself should not refuse to use the only means in existence to give the Protestant laity of the Anglican Church their just rights.

At any rate, it was clear that a debate in Parliament would move the country as nothing else would do. It would be reported in hundreds of newspapers. It would put an end to the conspiracy of silence, and lead to the agitation of the question all over the country, on hundreds of platforms, and in scores of magazines. Such is the constitution of English society, that it is only through Parliament that a great national question can be effectually debated. Centuries of national life have focussed in Parliament the vital forces of the nation, and till it gives a powerful utterance no great question will catch the ear of the nation, or ripen for solution.

They say there is a psychological moment for the birth of great questions. The action of the Pope in pronouncing Anglican Orders "utterly null and void" had aroused keen discussion among the advanced section of the clergy. Some of them had been hanging about the back stairs of the Vatican for years, hoping to get

the blessing of the Pope. Lord Halifax, representing the English Church Union with 4,000 clergy, was one of these negotiators, and when the bomb burst it was hoped by the Roman Curia that a large secession would occur. In this they were disappointed. The advanced Anglicans, while still hoping for corporate re-union with Rome, began to fall back more on Catholic antiquity as it was before the split between the East and the West, and attempts were made by some of them to get recognition from the Greek Church. The Pope issued a letter to the English people at this time, urging them to return to the See of St. Peter, and also an encyclical on the unity of the Church, to which the two Primates replied in language so deferential to the Pope as to disgust the Protestant feeling of the nation. I quote the opening paragraph of the reply :—

> It is the fortune of our office that often, when we would fain write about the common salvation, an occasion arises for debating some controverted question which cannot be postponed to another time. This certainly was recently the case when, in the month of September last, there suddenly arrived in this country from Rome a letter, already printed and published, which aimed at overthrowing our whole position as a Church. It was upon this letter that our minds were engaged with the attention it demanded when our beloved brother Edward, at that time Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England and Metropolitan, was in God's providence taken from us by sudden death. In his last written words he bequeathed to us the treatment of the question which he was doubtless himself about to treat with the greatest learning and theological grace. It has therefore seemed good to us, the Archbishops and Primates of England, that this answer should be written in order that the truth in this matter might be made known, both to our venerable brother Pope Leo XIII, in whose name the letter from Rome was issued, and also to all other bishops of the Christian Church settled throughout the world.

I should also add that shortly before this there had appeared that remarkable book, *The Secret History of the Oxford Movement*, by Mr. Walter Walsh, which laid bare the machinery by which the Romanizing party was changing the character of the Anglican Church. The facts stated in the book were indisputable. They were all taken from authentic documents, often of the most secret kind, and gave the impression of a vast conspiracy carried on for many years with signal success. It is true the book was one-sided, and hardly did justice to the real devotion and self-denial of many of these Ritualists; but it gave the public what it needed, viz.

a solid basis of fact, which has stood the test of the most rigorous criticism.

At the same time an incident happened (small in itself) which attracted much attention in the Press. Mr. John Kensit—like Jenny Geddes in Edinburgh—interrupted the service of "adoring the Cross" in a London church by calling out "This is idolatry!" and caused a great commotion. The newspapers began reporting the Roman Catholic character of many of the services, often conducted in strict conformity with the Roman Missal, and absolutely contrary to the English Prayer-book, to which the clergy had bound themselves by a solemn vow at their ordination. The *Daily Chronicle* gave copious details of such services all over London. I felt the time was ripe for laying the matter before Parliament if an opportunity could be found, and I placed the following notice on the order-book, in the hope that next Session, if not this one (1898), I might be able to bring it forward :—

Church of England (Ritual and Doctrine): That, in view of the rapid spread of Roman Catholic Doctrine and Ritual in the Church of England, and the apparent inability of the Bishops to grapple effectually with this evil, it is expedient that there should be appointed a Royal Commission to inquire fully into the subject, and to report on the best means for maintaining the Protestant constitution of the Church as defined by its articles and formularies, and by the Coronation Oath of the Sovereign, who is by law the supreme Governor of the Church of England, and who must answer in the affirmative the following question: "Will you, to the utmost of your power, maintain the true profession of the Gospel and the Protestant Reformed Religion established by law?"

This public notice brought me a flood of information on the subject. Letters poured in from all parts of England, relating how congregations had been driven out by Ritualistic clergy, and the services altered beyond recognition. I was implored to make these grievances known, and to urge that some remedy should be applied.

Shortly before this a small Bill, dealing with some of the abuses of patronage, the "Benefices Bill," had passed its second reading almost unobserved, and went through committee upstairs. It only dealt with faults and defects in presentees, but expressly excluded matters of doctrine and ritual. It provided means whereby parishioners might appeal to the bishop of the diocese against unfit men being presented to livings, and laid down rules of procedure in such cases.

It suddenly occurred to me that it might be possible to raise a debate on the growing ritualism of the clergy by a motion to reject the Bill on the report stage, on the ground that it failed to touch the greatest blot of all, viz. the unfaithfulness of so many of the clergy to the articles they had solemnly bound themselves to observe by their ordination vows, and I put down a motion to that effect, and also, as a second line of attack, I put down an amendment to include disloyalty to the Thirty-nine Articles and the Prayer-book among the causes for invalidating a presentation.

The serious question was how far the Speaker would allow such an enlargement of the scope of the debate. I prepared a speech for the rejection of the Bill purely on these grounds, and seconded the motion in a full House, and was practically allowed a free hand by Mr. Speaker. To my great surprise I had continuous applause from all parts of the House, and quite as much from the Conservative as from the Liberal benches. It seemed as if the whole House was of one opinion. A debate of several hours followed, and not one member spoke in favour of the Ritualist side. The most notable contribution was made by Sir William Harcourt, who delivered a most trenchant speech, going almost further than mine. This was the beginning of a series of speeches and of letters to the *Times*, in which he vindicated, with remarkable legal acumen, the Protestant constitution of the Reformed Church of England. Mr. Balfour replied very skilfully, admitting the serious nature of the evil, but holding that we had exaggerated it, and deprecating the raising of such discussions on a Bill drawn for a different purpose. One could not but feel that the Leader of the House knew that he was treading upon very thin ice, for not one of his own followers ventured to defend these Romanizing practices.

In the division that followed, a considerable number of Ministerialists abstained from voting, if I remember rightly, and several of them afterwards voted for my amendment; but this stage was carried, as we all expected, by a large majority.

However, the effect of the debate on public opinion was remarkable. The tone of the London Press next day was entirely altered. Most of the papers had been ignoring the question, or treating it as of small consequence. Now they came out with strong Protestant articles, and none more so than the *Times*, which from that period constituted itself the special champion of the Reformation settlement. It opened its columns to a large correspondence on the subject, which went on during the whole autumn, and usually filled

three or four columns daily. The complaints from all parts of England grew into a tempest and found full expression in the press, and the remarkable series of letters by Sir William Harcourt threw a flood of light on the legal and constitutional aspect of the case.

I received on the next day but one after the debate about eighty letters from all parts of England filled with complaints of the lawlessness of the Romanizing clergy, and for two or three years I had a never-ceasing stream of similar correspondence, mingled with attacks from the High Church clergy. I found it hardly possible to keep abreast of my correspondence, and this was the heaviest period of my Parliamentary life.

I raised another long and interesting debate on my amendment to include unfaithfulness to their ordination vows among the disqualification of presentees for a benefice. Again Harcourt made a most able speech. The reply of the Attorney-General (Sir Richard Webster) was feeble to a degree, and though the amendment was rejected, the feeling of the House was wholly with it. But the Government declined to proceed with the Bill if any alteration of a vital kind was made, and after several days of discussion it was forced through an unwilling House. The work of arousing the country was, however, completed, and the way was prepared for several even more important debates the following session; and, above all, the great point was gained that Parliament was competent to discuss Church questions, even on their religious and doctrinal side.

I subjoin my speech (as prepared) and that of Sir William Harcourt, and Mr. Balfour's reply, as they put in a nutshell the salient points of this controversy, and will allow me to dispense with going at length into the debates of the following session, when I presented the case much more fully.

BENEFICES BILL.

June 16, 1898.

MR. SAMUEL SMITH :—

I think the House will feel that it is impossible to part with this Bill without making a protest against the alarming spread of Roman Catholic doctrine and ritual in the National Church. Many of us feel that to pass a Bill dealing with the misconduct of presentees to benefices and to leave out by far the most common form of misconduct, namely, disloyalty to the Articles of the Church, is like the play of Hamlet with the part of Hamlet left out.

We have few opportunities in this House of discussing such matters. Many of us feel that Parliament is not a suitable body to handle Church

affairs, but as long as the Protestant Reformed religion is by law established, there are cases when Parliament is bound to interfere, and surely this is one of them. The country is stirred and alarmed, as it has not been for many years, at the anarchy that prevails in the Church. A section of the clergy are Romanist in all but the name; they are introducing every Roman doctrine and ceremony in its public worship; they treat the Thirty-nine Articles and Prayer-book with contempt, notwithstanding that they made this solemn declaration at their ordination :—

"I clerk, do solemnly make the following declaration: I assent to the Articles of religion and to the Book of Common Prayer. I believe the doctrine of the Church of England as therein set forth to be agreeable to the Word of God and in public prayer and administration of the sacraments I will use the form in the said book prescribed and none other except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority."

If ever Parliament has a right to interfere now is the time. The action of Mr. Kensit, himself a loyal Churchman, has compelled attention. Will the House let me read from a letter which I have received from him ?

"On Good Friday I attended St. Cuthbert's district parish church. The service was not a Prayer-book service, but admitted as being taken from services for Holy Week, a Roman Catholic work. The Crucifix, which was covered in crape, was taken from the Table, and the side pieces of wood shown to the people by the clergyman with this remark each time as each side was shown: 'Behold the wood of the Cross,' the Choir replying, 'Come let us adore it.' The people then all bowed, the figure or image upon the wood was then uncovered, and after the clergyman had laid it on the floor on a cushion, he kissed the figure, and then choir and people did the same, all going down on to the floor. I went up to the figure and taking it into my left hand, facing the people, I said, 'in God's name I denounce this idolatry in the Church of England, God help me.' I used no violence, and then gave the Crucifix into the hands of the Vicar. I was then fiercely struck, and had to call *murder*."

I am not going either to praise or blame this honest and intrepid man, but simply to point to what is going on in scores of churches without let or hindrance from the Bishops, though they have solemnly subscribed Article XXII, which says :—

"The Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory, Pardons, Worshipping and Adoration as well of Images as of Reliques, and also invocation of Saints, is a fond thing vainly invented and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God."

These same Bishops have solemnly bound themselves "with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's Word," and yet they have allowed these practices to go on for many years, waxing worse and worse, without any real effort to check them. No doubt many members of the House have read the reports published by the *Daily Chronicle* of the services in several of the London Ritualistic churches. I will only observe that

they were indistinguishable from Roman Catholic services. In all these churches the Mass was celebrated without disguise ; transubstantiation was taught in its most extreme form ; reservation of the Sacrament for worship ; prayer to the Virgin Mary and Saints and Masses for the dead were celebrated. At St. Michael's, Shoreditch, the Roman Missal and Breviary were used ; and the sermon by Mr. Evans was an exposition of the doctrine of Purgatory from the orthodox Roman Catholic point of view ; the notices before the sermon included a request for prayers for the dead, and an announcement that there would be High Mass on all Saints' days, and Low Mass at other times. The congregation repeated after the clergyman the following ascriptions :—

" Blessed be God.
Blessed be His Holy Name.
Blessed be Jesus Christ, true God and true man.
Blessed be His most Sacred Heart.
Blessed be Jesus in the most Holy Sacrament of the Altar.
Blessed be the great Mother of God, Mary most Holy.
Blessed be Her Holy and Immaculate Conception.
Blessed be the name of Mary, Virgin and Mother.
Blessed be God in His Angels and in His Saints."

The clergyman seemed to be unaware that he had solemnly subscribed to Article XXII and Article XXVIII, which state :—

" Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by holy Writ ; but it is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

" The Body of Christ is given, taken and eaten, in the Supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the supper is Faith.

" The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped."

In most of these ritualistic churches the clergyman declares that he is a sacrificing priest, and that in the Mass he offers up Christ for the living and the dead. At St. Cuthbert's, Kensington, the celebrant went through the Roman Missal, he kissed the altar, and genuflected at the places where the Missal directs those ceremonies ; a bell was rung at the Sanctus, and at the adoration of the wafer and chalice, etc.

I apologize for bringing such details before the House ; but it is absolutely necessary to show the utter contradiction between the Articles of the Church, and the practices of many of the clergy. These ritualists have subscribed the Thirty-first Article, which states :—

" Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits."

What would be thought in any of the professions of such outrageous violation of solemn pledges ; if an officer of the army and navy swears allegiance to the Sovereign and then conspires to betray his trust we know by what name to describe him. Is it otherwise with a minister

of an Established Church ? Is not the law of truth and honour equally binding on all men ? Is the cleric alone to be allowed to say " white is black and black is white ? " The cry of persecution is nowadays raised whenever we demand that a public servant shall observe the contract he has made with the State. Is it fair to call by the name of persecution the enforcement of a contract into which a man has voluntarily entered, and for which he has received a valuable consideration ? If the consciences of these clergy are aggrieved there is an easy remedy: let them retire from a church whose doctrines they repudiate and join the church whose doctrines they believe. The English people may be poor judges of the value of albs and birettas and chasubles and copes, and the other descriptions of man-millinery, but they are tolerable judges of honesty, and they insist that these Romanists, masquerading in the Church of England, should go to the church they inwardly believe in.

If there is any one thing that the people of this country detest it is the Confessional. They hate the idea that their wives and daughters are to be questioned by a priest as to their most secret thoughts ; yet in many churches Confessional boxes are set up, and young boys and girls coming to confirmation are told they cannot be received unless they go to sacramental confession. Books for the young are published and used by many of the clergy. I quote from one issued by a Committee of Clergy belonging to the Society of the Holy Cross for children six and a half or seven years old.

" It is to the priest, and to the priest only, that a child must acknowledge his sins, if he desires that God should forgive him. Do you know why ? It is because God, when on earth, gave to His priests, and to them alone, the Divine power of forgiving men their sins."

" Go to the priest, who is the doctor of your soul, and who cures it in the name of God."

" I have known poor children who concealed their sins in Confession for years. They were very unhappy, were tormented with remorse, and if they had died in that state, they would certainly have gone to the everlasting fires of hell."

It is well known that odious books, like *The Priest in Absolution*, are largely used by Ritualistic clergy. This book contains questions so improper that it was condemned strongly by all the Bishops in Convocation, and in the House of Lords. Archbishop Tait said :—

" It is a disgrace to the community that such a book should be circulated under the authority of clergymen of the Established Church."

" I cannot imagine that any right-minded man could wish to have such questions (as those suggested in the *Priest in Absolution*) addressed to any member of his family ; and if he had any reason to suppose that any member of his family had been exposed to such an examination, I am sure it would be the duty of any father of a family to remonstrate with the clergyman who had put the questions, and warn him never to approach his house again."

Lord Redesdale described it as " a grossly indecent and abominable book " ; many of the quotations he made from it could not be pub-

lished even in Hansard : yet I believe it is still in use, and I demand as an English citizen that our boys and girls shall not be polluted by such questions.

The House will agree with Lord Salisbury when he said in 1873 :—

" Among the English people generally, among thinking men, there is no difference of opinion upon this question of habitual confession. We have seen it tried in other countries. It was tried in olden time in our own. We know that besides its being unfavourable to that which we believe to be Christian truth, in its result it has been injurious to the moral independence and virility of the nation to an extent to which probably it has been given to no other institution to affect the character of mankind. I believe that if there are men in this country who think they will ever persuade the English people to adopt the practice of habitual confession, they are proposing the most chimerical and the wildest scheme that ever entered into the heads of any men. No doubt our Church does not encourage habitual confession, and that practice is opposed to the religious convictions of the English people. But it is not only a religious question. It so happens that this practice is deeply opposed to the peculiarities and idiosyncrasies which have been developed among the English people ever since they became a free people. The English people are specially jealous of putting unrestricted power into the hands of a single man. More than any other system the practice of habitual confession does put unrestricted and irresponsible power into the hands of a single man. An Englishman values and cherishes the private independence of his family life ; he looks with abhorrence upon any system that introduces another power into that family life, that introduces a third person between father and daughter and husband and wife. I believe that these reasons, apart from religious doctrine, have such powerful influence upon the English people that it would require the very strongest conviction of a positive revelation to induce them to conform to a practice which is so utterly opposed to their habits and feelings."

No one can tell how many persons have been demoralized by the Confessional. Archdeacon Allen stated in Convocation in 1877 that he heard from a venerable and wise High Churchman " that in his own experience he had known three clergymen who had practised this teaching of Habitual Confession as a duty who had fallen into habits of immorality with women who had come to them for guidance."

I believe the opinion of Parliament to-day is the same as that of Archbishop Tait and Lord Salisbury in 1873.

The people of this country are very practical in character : they are but little interested in metaphysical doctrines, but their common sense and moral instincts revolt at the practice of Auricular Confession ; and if any one thing will cause the downfall of the National Church it will be the habitual use of Confession. The English people will not permit their country to become a second Spain ; and as soon as they grasp the idea that this is the aim of the ritualistic clergy they will make short work of them.

Let me say in conclusion that the necessity for prompt action was

never so great as now. The country has become alive to the existence of a wide-spread conspiracy to Romanize the Church of England. That remarkable book, *The Secret History of the Oxford Movement*, has laid bare the conspiracy. It shows from authentic documents how many secret societies exist in the Church, the common object of which is to undermine the Thirty-nine Articles, to destroy the Protestant character of the Church, and to prepare for its reunion with the Church of Rome. This is the avowed object of "The Order of Corporate Reunion."[1] It has Bishops secretly consecrated who are prepared to give re-ordination to such of the clergy as will submit to it. Dr. F. G. Lee, Vicar of All Saints, Lambeth, is believed to be one of these Bishops who possess Orders which Roman priests have acknowledged to be valid ; and he is believed to have secretly re-ordained several hundred Anglican clergy. He has never denied this charge. He has publicly stated :—

"As I am personally challenged on this point I hold, and have always held (mere rough contradictions have no effect on me) that the Pope is the Archbishop's (of Canterbury) direct spiritual superior both in rank and authority."[2]

To show how this movement is regarded by the Vatican I quote from a letter in the *Civilta Cattolica*, the organ of the Jesuits at Rome, from a letter from its English correspondent in 1878 :—

"The Order of Corporate Reunion actively pursues its labours, and its officers have sent forth a Pastoral Letter containing an exposition of its views and ends. It is known that several Anglican ministers in connexion with this Society have induced a Greek Bishop—whose name however, it has not as yet been possible to ascertain—to ordain them under certain conditions, in order that the doubt to which Anglican Orders are subject may not be alleged as a reason for taking exception to the validity of their operations. The three leading officers of the Order have received Episcopal Consecration from the same quarter—a quarter which, according to what is said, is of such a character as to completely exclude any question as to the validity of the Orders so conferred, when once the time shall come for submitting the matter for examination to the Holy See. So soon as a sufficient number of the Anglican clergy shall have in this way removed the difficulty which arises from their ordination, the Order hopes to be able to present its petition for Corporate Reunion with the Catholic Church, signed by a number of members so imposing as to render it impossible for the Holy See not to recognize the gravity and importance of the movement."

I only make one more quotation from the Roman *Catholic Standard and Ransomer* in 1894, edited by a priest who was formerly an advanced Ritualistic clergyman :—

"We have heard just lately that there are now 800 clergymen of the Church of England who have been validly ordained by Dr. Lee and his Co-Bishops of the Order of Corporate Reunion. If so, Dr. Lee's dream of providing a body with which the Pope could deal seems likely to be realized."[3]

Surely it is not too much to ask the House to affirm that the members

of this Papal society should be ineligible to hold a benefice in the Church of England. But other secret and semi-secret societies go a long way in the same direction, such as the Society of the Holy Cross, the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, the Order of the Holy Redeemer. One of the high officials of this last named wrote in 1892 in the *Barnet Times* :—

"I believe that the Pope is, not by honorary Primacy, but by Divine appointment and by the mercy of God, Supreme Head of the whole Church of Christ throughout the world, and that those who refuse his rule forfeit all title to the name of Catholicity.

"Moreover, I believe that in discipline, doctrine and morality, the Church of England has been utterly corrupt, as the need of the Oxford Revival and the malignant opposition to it from the children of this world has fully attested, and I believe that no man is justified in staying within that Church, save when he feels the vocation of God to assist in restoring her to her lost place, in humble, implicit and unquestioning submission to the See of Peter, and to the authority of our Holy Father, the Pope, which is the object of the Order of the Holy Redeemer."

I trust I have said sufficient to show how deep and widespread is the conspiracy to Romanize the Church of England. A vast body of the clergy belong to the Societies that aim at reunion with Rome ; about 4,000 belong to the English Church Union, including several Bishops. The head of the Society, Lord Halifax, stated : "Is there a single instructed Christian who would not prefer Leo XIII to the Privy Council ? . . . . Do not let us be afraid to speak plainly of the possibility of the desirability of a union with Rome ; let us say boldly we desire peace with Rome with all our hearts." (Bristol speech, 1895.) There cannot be a doubt that some of the Bishops sympathize with this movement, hence their extraordinary feebleness and apathy ; and nothing will be done by the Bishops unless forced on by public opinion. For a long time past nearly all the high offices have been conferred on High Churchmen. To be a Protestant is to be boycotted. To be faithful to his ordination vows excludes a clergyman from any chance of preferment. Meanwhile there is the deepest indignation among a large body of the laity. I have received a great many letters from all parts of the country urging me to go on with this matter. These letters are from churchmen who complain that they are driven out of their parishes by unblushing Romanism. In some cases the whole congregation has been driven out. I know of such cases myself. I am sure that the Government is quite unaware what a storm is brewing. England is fast working up into a condition like that which preceded the Long Parliament. If I am not mistaken we are approaching troublous times. The vast bulk of the population of this country is still Protestant, and utterly opposed to Rome ; it will find some way of enforcing its convictions. It is true this Bill is not well adapted for restraining Romish practices ; though I have put down an amendment which will tend strongly in that direction. But the machinery of the Bill can only be put in force by a Bishop ; there lies the fatal defect. The Public Worship Regulation Act was practically

neutralized by the veto of the Bishop ; if this veto were removed, the penalty of deprivation was enforced, that Act could be m effective. We need to give the laity the rights that belong to th as has been done in the Irish Episcopal Church, and if Governm cannot graft such provisions on this Bill let them promise to bring in that will effect the end. If this is not done this agitation will grow a tempest which will sweep away some things which we should be so to see disappear from the life of the nation.

THE RT. HON. SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT :—

. . . What is the allegation made by my honourable Friend (Samuel Smith)—an allegation which I believe to be thoroughly v founded ? His allegation is that there is at the present moment in Church of England a conspiracy to overthrow the principles of English Reformation ; a conspiracy widely spread and deeply root To become aware that that conspiracy exists you have only to r the statements made in Convocation the other day. I think one of bishops used the expression that he was aware that there were sec societies in the Church of England for the purpose of overthrow the principles of the English Reformation. Now that you are go to deal with the question of institution to benefices, is there, I ask, a ground upon which institution to a benefice in the Church of Engla ought to be refused stronger than that of perjury on the part of clergyman ? What is to be thought of a perjured priest who has tal an oath, which he is violating, publicly or secretly, that he would pur the practices authorised by the Church of England, and none oth Is it true that the clergy as a body do observe that declaration ? have the statements of the Bishops themselves that they know t that is not the case. " Oh," it is said, " but there is now a disposit to restrain these law-breakers." Well, Sir, I hope there is, but I m say that that disposition has not been conspicuous of recent years. have seen no disposition to discourage the appointment and promot of clergymen by whom those objectionable practices are usually carr on. But, even if there is such a disposition, is the House of Comm not to be allowed to take part in discussing a Bill which raises th important issues ? We have the evidence before us of the certific which the honourable member who made this Motion read to the Ho from the Archbishop of York, that there should be a certificate, giv by three beneficed clergymen or by the bishop of the diocese from wh the nominee came, that he was a man who had observed his ordinat oath, and that he had not departed in his practice or his conduct fr that which was implied in his declaration. Why, Sir, that ought be, in my opinion, one of the very first declarations, and quite binding on the nominee as any declaration with reference to his priv character or his moral conduct. There is one reason, above all, wh in my opinion, this matter ought to be dealt with. Who are th men ? They are the men who in every parish in England are practica the conductors of the voluntary schools. These are the men into wh schools you force the children—the children of people who have r

abjured the principles of the English Reformation—who are to be taught by these men to follow these practices; and is the House of Commons, which has compelled and is compelling the children of Protestant Churchmen and Protestant Nonconformists to go into these schools, to have no protection against the authors of practices of this character? This is not a question of religious opinion. If these men do not conscientiously hold the opinions of the Church of England, let them leave her and join the Church with which their opinions are in sympathy. But for these men to remain in the Church of England and in secret societies, of which I have heard a great deal, and have the control of the education of the children in the parishes of England, is a state of things which, in my opinion, Parliament ought not to tolerate. When I was in office and the bishops came to me expressing a wish for certain legislation, I gave them what I thought was very sound advice. I said: "I think the less the bishops and the Church come to the House of Commons the better for them"; but if they do come here for more powers the House of Commons ought to put upon them conditions which are consistent and necessary, and there should be some security against the principles on which the Established Church of this country is founded being deliberately violated in this secret and —I agree with my honourable friend—in this dishonourable manner, and against a conspiracy to subvert the true principles of the Church of England. I, for one at all events, will not give a vote in favour of this Bill. I shall vote against the Bill as absolutely inadequate unless we have some understanding on the part of the Government that this measure, in addition to what it professes to do, shall give to the bishops the power, and shall impose on them the duty, of not instituting to benefices clergy who are deliberately violating the conditions upon which they hold those benefices.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (MR. A. J. BALFOUR):—

I think that everybody who has heard the statement of the honourable gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Compton Rickett, member for Scarborough) will feel that it is one which does him credit. We cannot expect that every member of this House shall be either a member of the Church of England or especially interested in that great ecclesiastical body, but what we do ask is, and what we can ask honourable gentlemen with confidence is, that in every effort to reform any acknowledged and recognized abuse in that Church, we shall have the support of every man, be his theological opinions what they may, in carrying out the intentions which we have in view. I wish I could think that honourable gentlemen who have spoken to-night felt that the considerations which have weighed with the honourable member for Scarborough have weighed with themselves. I have listened to almost every speech, but I must confess I have heard with regret that some honourable gentlemen are prepared to sacrifice—for it amounts to that—certain reforms which this Bill contains, in the hope, not that we shall have this Session, but that we shall have at some

future time a measure carrying out other objects which, however desirable in themselves, must be distinctly separated from the object which this Bill seeks to carry out. I have heard to-night two entirely different sets of argument against the consideration of the Report stage. Sir, after all this is a belated second reading debate, and I cannot help feeling—I will not say that the Committee of the House have been abused—that a somewhat excessive advantage has been taken of the forms of the House to bring before it considerations which would be perfectly relevant to a second reading debate, but which are somewhat belated after the second reading has been passed by an overwhelming majority, and after the measure itself has stood the fierce investigation and critical discussion in the Grand Committee to which it has been referred. The first set of arguments is strictly relevant to the subject matter of the Bill. The criticisms advanced by my honourable friends, the members for Lowestoft and Hereford, were directed to the Bill and what it contained. They objected to the Bill; they desired to reject it at this stage, and their ambition would be entirely satisfied if the Government were to declare the Bill now withdrawn. The other set of arguments was of an entirely different character. They were advanced by gentlemen who have on previous occasions indicated their friendship to the Bill, and who are now apparently prepared to sacrifice it and the reforms it embodies in order to raise other and more burning controversies, the importance of which I am the last to deny, but whose strict relevancy to the question before us I confess I individually cannot see. As regards the criticisms directed against the Bill by my honourable friend, the member for Lowestoft, I do not think I need detain the House very long. My honourable friend's doctrine goes the length of stating, unless I misunderstood him, that no amount of traffic in the next sale of presentations was a matter with which this Legislature need concern itself. Indeed, he went almost the length of saying that the patron of the living was not responsible for the character, ability or capacity of the person he appointed, but that the whole responsibility of seeing that fit persons were appointed to livings under our existing system of patronage lay, not with the patron, but with the bishop. I thought that a very extravagant and a very unsustainable doctrine; but it became more extravagant and more unsustainable when my honourable friend went on, in the second part of his speech, to say that the responsibilities thrown upon the bishop by the existing law, as I understood him—certainly by the law as it would be if this Bill pass—were already too severe, that the bishop's powers were too great, and the responsibility which he had to support was too weighty. Sir, I cannot reconcile those two arguments. The whole responsibility of appointing fit persons in the Church of England rests, not with the patrons, but with the bishops. Surely, the corollary of that thesis is that the power of the bishops cannot be too much increased, and that the instruments given by them by law for dealing with the responsibilities thrown upon them by law cannot be made too effective. My honourable friend went on to say that the Bill was injurious to the clergy and a slur on the Church of England. All I

can say is that if the Bill is injurious to the clergy, the clergy have taken a very strange way of expressing their injury ; and if the Bill is a slur on the Church of England, the Church of England has shown itself singularly insensitive to the insult. There is not a body representing the clergy or the men interested in the welfare of the Church of England which has not, in the course of the last few months, passed a resolution strongly in favour of the Bill. I think, perhaps, I need not labour this point more elaborately, because, in this respect, at all events, I think the great majority of the House are in agreement with the sentiments I have expressed. I am sure my honourable friend who moved the rejection of the Bill, and my honourable friend, the member for Hereford, expressed their own views with great ability, but I do not think they are entertained by any considerable body of opinion on either side of the House. I therefore pass on to the second, more important and by far the most striking and impressive, but also the more irrelevant, discussion which was initiated in the speech of the honourable member for Flintshire. The honourable member has taken the occasion which the forms of the House afford him to raise burning controversies associated with recent discussions connected with ritual in certain churches in London—I think, almost, if not entirely, confined to London.

An Honourable Member : Oh, no ! All over the country.

The First Lord of the Treasury : Not all over the country ; but my present point is that the honourable gentleman has taken the opportunity, as undoubtedly the forms of the House allowed him, of raising a question not touched on in the Bill, but in which he takes a deep interest, and in which he rightly thinks the public of this country at the present moment take a deep interest. I do not blame the honourable gentleman for taking the opportunity, but I do blame him for making the opportunity of a discussion upon certain questions of ritual a ground for rejecting a Bill which is intended to deal with an entirely different class of grievances. I make criticisms upon him on that score, but while I certainly agree with a great deal that fell from him, I think he was not altogether free from the defect which is apt to attach to all who rush into these burning controversies, namely, the error of exaggerating the number of facts which make for his case. He not only told us what I am afraid is perfectly true, that there are a certain number of churches in this country where services are conducted quite differently from the services contemplated by the English Church service, and where doctrines are adumbrated which have little connexion with the doctrines of the Church of England—he was not content with that statement, but went on to make a general attack on the bishops, and to give us certain statements which I confess I cannot help thinking were legends, with regard to occult, dark schemes of general conversion to the Church of Rome—of Orders regarded as valid in the Church of Rome being given by clergymen of the Church of England, and other matters of that kind. I confess that with regard to these latter stories, I have not had the opportunity of seeing the evidence the honourable gentleman might be able to bring forward, but in the light of such knowledge as is open to all of us, not of the views of the Church of

England, but of the theological doctrines of the Church of Rome, I cannot believe that even if there were a clergyman of the Church of England so perverted as to desire to be given episcopal orders in the Church of Rome in order to ordain clergymen in the Church of England, if there were a man who had such wishes or desires—I cannot believe he would find in the Church of Rome any one who would favour his aspirations. But as regards the Church of England, the honourable Gentleman told the House that no less than thirteen bishops belonged to the English Church Union.

[1] Mr. S. Smith: I said thirty, but I did not confine myself to thirty.

The First Lord of the Treasury: I have not had time since the honourable gentleman spoke to make critical inquiry into this matter, but I am informed that not a single diocesan bishop in England or Wales belongs to the English Church Union. If that is a specimen of the accuracy with which the honourable gentleman has got up his facts, I think the House will feel that, however sound his arguments may be against the ritualistic practices of certain clergymen, his general indictment of the authorities of the Church is one that deserves very little confidence. But the honourable gentleman found a powerful supporter —I do not know whether he was an unexpected supporter—in the Leader of the Opposition. The honourable member for Flintshire is justly open to the accusation that he somewhat rashly stated facts and was guilty of a certain amount of unintentional exaggeration. It is, indeed, not necessary that I should state to the House, who are acquainted with the right honourable gentleman's methods, that he far surpassed the honourable member in both these peculiarities. The right honourable member has never been able to restrain himself on this topic. One of my very earliest recollections, indeed, I may say my earliest recollection, in this House, now going back twenty-four years, is that of the controversy between the right honourable gentleman and Mr. Gladstone upon the Public Worship Regulation Bill, which was almost the first measure introduced after I became a member of this House; and I shall never forget the admirable speech in which Mr. Gladstone attacked, and, as I think, demolished the right honourable gentleman on that occasion, and, if I have not forgotten, I am sure the victim of the speech will still less have forgotten it. I was so interested in the right honourable gentleman's speech that I sent, in order to revive my recollection, for the volume of *Hansard* which contains the accounts of this great duel. I observe that Mr. Gladstone then said:—

"The fact is that my right honourable and learned friend is still in his Parliamentary youth, and has not yet sown his Parliamentary wild oats."

He went on to say:—

[1] I believe I said thirty bishops, mostly colonial. The facts are at present as follow: 33 bishops are members of the English Church Union. Of these 14 are colonial, 10 American, 3 Scottish Episcopal, 1 the Bishop of Lincoln, and 5 returned colonial bishops.—S. S.

"If it is desired to maintain that establishment of religion—the English Church—then I say that moderation in act and temper and mildness in language are absolutely necessary for those who undertake to guide the House in that difficult and perilous question."

I think it will be admitted by all those who had the advantage of hearing the speech of the right honourable gentleman to-night, that that advice so given by Mr. Gladstone twenty-four years ago has, as far as those topics are concerned, not yet been followed by the right honourable gentleman, and that, as far as matters ecclesiastical are concerned, he is still in his Parliamentary youth, and has not yet sown his Parliamentary wild oats. What did the right honourable gentleman tell us? He told us that in every parish of this country—I think that was his phrase—we drove the children of Nonconformist and Churchman alike, the Protestant children, into the schools, and compelled them to hear the doctrines enunciated in certain catechisms to which the honourable member for Flintshire made reference. What relation has that statement to the facts of the case? In how many of the 14,000 parishes of this country does the clergyman of the parish teach doctrines which, even in view of the honourable member for Flintshire, are inconsistent with the Protestant religion, the Thirty-nine Articles and the Prayer-book.

Sir W. Harcourt: A great many.

The First Lord of the Treasury: I entirely dissent from the right honourable gentleman. If I should say that the statement is erroneous to the amount of 99 per cent., I should have done more than justice to the right honourable gentleman; and I think you might go through the parochial schools of this country, go to the parish services of this country, one by one, and you would find that the number of parish services which are open to the criticism of the honourable member for Flintshire, and still more of the Leader of the Opposition, is almost infinitesimal. I do not deny that the great majority of the House share the views of those who have expressed their regret at the practices in ritual of which we have heard enough, and more than enough, to-night. It matters very little what an individual member's opinion may be, but my own opinion agrees with the view that has been expressed. I hold an opinion, shared, I believe, not by one party in the Church of England, but by every party in the Church of England—every party without exception in the Church of England—and I share the feelings of regret that those practices have gone on, productive as they are of much scandal, and open as they are to objection of the most serious kind from every point of view. But, Sir, that is not the question before the House. The question before the House is: Are we to turn a Bill intended to deal with a certain class of evil into another and different Bill intended to deal with a different class of evil? It is vain for any man to pretend that he is in favour of this Bill if, at the present stage, after it has passed through Committee, he proposes to revolutionize its character. The thing cannot be done; it cannot even be done on the honourable member's own principle. What was his principle? His principle was—the whole view underlying his speech was—that you

cannot trust the bishops of the Church of England in matters of doctrine and ritual.

Mr. S. Smith : Hear, hear !

The First Lord of the Treasury : Well, this measure, which does not deal with matters of doctrine and ritual, does trust the bishops ; and it would be absolutely impossible so to modify this Bill as to meet the views of those who wish it to be, not a Bill dealing with certain abuses connected with patronage, but a Bill dealing with doctrine and ritual. The necessity of any Bill dealing with such matters, though such necessity may arise, is a necessity which I should regard as of tragic import to all the best interests of the Church. I remember the discussions on the Bill to which I have already referred—the Public Worship Regulation Bill of 1874—and I cannot believe that any repetition of those discussions would be otherwise than a misfortune—a misfortune which might indeed be the less of two evils, but which would be in itself one of the greatest evils which could befall the community. But, Sir, I do not think we need discuss that question now. The question before the House is the question whether you will destroy a measure of reform, not for the purpose of bringing in another measure of reform, but for the purpose—I really do not quite know what—of emphasizing those beliefs in the Protestantism of the country which I do not think are in question at the present time. The honourable member will hardly maintain that the safety of the Protestant religion consists in permitting the sale of next presentations. I cannot believe that he, who is, I believe, genuinely interested in the health and welfare of every religious organization in this country, is seriously desirous to prevent us from carrying out the reforms which he admits to be desirable, simply because we did not draft at the last hour a new Bill—a Bill which it would be quite impossible, if it could be drafted, to deal with in the course of the present Session, and of the necessity for which I do not think the House is as yet convinced. I do not know whether the honourable member intends to proceed to a division. If he does proceed to a division, with any hope of carrying the amendment, I cannot imagine how he reconciles such a course with his conscience.

Sir W. Harcourt : Why not ?

The First Lord of the Treasury : Why not ? I will tell the right honourable gentleman. The right honourable gentleman has never in his life desired a reform except so far as he could turn it into political capital. (" Oh, oh ! " Cheers, and cries of " Shame ! " and " Withdraw ! " followed by prolonged interruption.)

Mr. Speaker : The right honourable gentleman has not exceeded the rules of order. If he had, I should have called him to order.

The First Lord of the Treasury : I have not exceeded the bounds of order ; I may have exceeded the bounds of courtesy. Let me modify my observation, and say that the right honourable gentleman has never desired a reform which did not happen to fit in with the popular clamour. I will modify my expression again—with the popular feeling of the moment. I think now I have at once made my meaning clear and saved the feelings of the right honourable gentleman. Now, Sir,

the right honourable gentleman is extremely anxious not to pass a reform which does not cause great popular excitement, but he is anxious to have a discussion which will create great popular excitement, hence the difference of opinion between us. I confess that I am anxious to pass a reform which is admitted to be a reform by almost everybody in this House, although it has not those elements of popular excitement so dear to the heart of the right honourable gentleman. I trust that the House will not consent to allow a useful reform to be killed merely for the purpose of enabling the right honourable gentleman to repeat in 1898 the speeches he made in 1874, because the amount of gain would not be worth the sacrifice. The gain would be great, no doubt, but it would not be worth the sacrifice. I think that, put in that way, it does not hurt the feelings of the right honourable gentleman. Well, Sir, I do not believe that the honourable member for Flintshire takes the same view as the right honourable gentleman. I think he will recognize that the rejection of this Bill would not help his cause in the least. He must have seen by the reception accorded to his speech that the cause he has at heart is one which has an immense body of public sympathy behind it. We all recognize that. The cause will not, however, be aided by the rejection of the Bill. On the other hand, its rejection this Session would put off a reform which has long been desired by all who are interested in the Church of England, which has been recommended by Commission after Commission, which was approved at the stage of second reading without a division, and which the honourable member for Flintshire, I believe, himself desires in his heart. Let him not disguise from himself that, by taking the course he has taken, he is not helping the cause of Church reform, but is deferring for an indefinite period a change which he desires as much as I do. If we are to mix this subject up with those other burning controversies, which have already caused such difficulties and divisions in the communities generally, and in this House, an injury will be done to a Church of which the honourable member is not a member, but of which he desires to promote the welfare and utility. I trust, therefore, that all who share the views of the honourable member upon the question of Church reform will abstain from following him into the Lobby, and will obey his principles rather than endeavour to carry out the amendment he has placed on the paper. Sir, I do not know that I need add anything to what I have said, except this: the House has not only travelled beyond a second reading debate at this stage, but has travelled into one of the most thorny and difficult controversies in which it could be involved. If this controversy is to be seriously taken up by the House, it cannot be in connexion with a Bill which has passed through three-fourths of its course. It cannot be dealt with at the end of a Session, when the whole time of the House is already allotted. Let the House, therefore, not be misled by the great mass of truth which is contained in the statement of the honourable gentleman, however exaggerated that statement may have been in particulars or erroneous in details. Let it rather set itself to work at the task which is appointed for it, and endeavour, by passing this Bill, to carry out

once for all a long-needed and much-needed reform in the Church of England.

So as not to interrupt the sequence of my narrative, I have passed on to the debates on the Church Question in the month of June, but I must now return to the great event of the year—the death of Mr. Gladstone—which occurred at Hawarden in May, and the public ceremonial which followed. The outbreak of love and admiration which took place at his decease was astonishing. The voice of detraction ceased entirely, and nothing was heard all over the country, and indeed all over the civilized world, but a chorus of praise and thanksgiving for a noble life dedicated to the service of God and man. The retirement of the last few years had removed Mr. Gladstone from the arena of strife, and enabled the world to take in more truly the colossal proportions of his marvellous intellect and his superhuman activity. During his last illness at Hawarden a hush fell upon the nation, as it did a few years later when good Queen Victoria was passing away. These two deaths bore testimony to the amazing power of a pious and consistent life when united to great gifts and an eminent career. The tributes paid to Mr. Gladstone in Parliament were most impressive. The speeches of Mr. Balfour, Sir William Harcourt and Mr. Dillon were specially excellent, but I think the finest eulogy was by Lord Rosebery in the House of Lords—the true successor of Mr. Gladstone, so far as public oratory is concerned. I reproduce it in the Appendix (XVIII.).

The funeral in Westminster Abbey was most impressive. The members of the House of Commons, headed by the Speaker, marched four abreast through Westminster Hall, and occupied the east transept of the Abbey. Nearly all the leading men of the nation were present, and the pall-bearers included the Prince of Wales, Lord Salisbury, Lord Rosebery, Sir William Harcourt, Arthur Balfour and others. The service was choral, and Mr. Gladstone's three favourite hymns were sung aloud by the vast assembly with wonderful effect. These were "Rock of Ages," "O God, our help in ages past," and "Praise to the Holiest in the Height." A noble simplicity characterized the service, as became a man who declined all honours and decorations, and died as he lived, plain Mr. Gladstone, an English Christian gentleman.

When Mr. Morley's forthcoming life appears we shall have a

rich treat, for we shall have a survey of the history of England and of the British Empire for the greater part of last century, seen through the life of its greatest son. It will not be denied that Mr. Gladstone was the greatest figure that ever appeared in the Parliamentary arena. For about sixty years he was a member of that assembly, and for fifty of these he played a leading part—for the last thirty the greatest part. No one ever spoke so much or so eloquently. No doubt occasional finished orations, like the best of Bright's, Sheridan's, Macaulay's, or Burke's, may have touched a higher level, but for ubiquity of knowledge and for the power of moving men to great issues over a vast mass of complicated questions, no one has equalled or approached Mr. Gladstone. His mind was a kind of microcosm of humanity. "Homo sum, nihil humanum a me alienum puto." He was equally instinct with life when pleading the cause of oppressed races like the Neapolitans under King Bomba, or the Bulgarians or Armenians under Abdul Hamid, "the Great Assassin"; or when liberating trade from the shackles of an oppressive tariff, as in his great Budget speeches; or when pleading for a widening of human liberties, as in his great reform bills; or when working for peace and international concord, as in the Alabama Arbitration; or in his heroic attempts to repair the age-long wrongs and sufferings of Ireland. Whatever cause he championed he did so with his whole heart and soul, often regardless of reputation, or even of its effect on his political career. He had an element of chivalry and idealism in his nature—the Celtic inheritance of his Gaelic mother, Miss Robertson of Dingwall—yet it was allied to the sagacity and plodding endurance of the Lowland Scotch, of which his father was a typical instance. From his boyhood at Eton till extreme old age his tireless intellect was ever at work, producing even after fourscore works of high merit like his review of Bishop Butler, and his *Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture*. In my humble judgment he has had no equal in modern times for omnivorous mental activity, though, by reason of his many-sidedness, he did not attain the highest place in any department of knowledge, except politics. But the ground tone of his life, and its bed-rock, so to speak, was an intense belief in the presence and power of God, as exerted in the Christian Revelation and through the Christian Church. As Lord Salisbury truly said: "He was a great Christian." His original intention was to enter the Christian ministry, and it is said that at his father's desire he put it aside, and so deprived England of her greatest Archbishop!

All through life his Church interests lay deepest. He was early in life caught by the stream of the Oxford movement, which was in its inception a protest against the secularism of the age, and was a revival of spiritual Christianity on sacerdotal lines.

Newman's sermons in St. Mary's were to Oxford what Latimer's sermons were at the Cross of St. Paul's three centuries before, or what Luther's sermons were at Wittemberg, or Knox's at St. Giles's. Though widely differing in many ways, all these apostolic men agreed in proclaiming with intense fervour the importance of things unseen and eternal. In this way Mr. Gladstone's High Church devotion permeated his life from college days at Oxford, and grew and strengthened as life went on. His mind was largely historical. He read the Fathers, especially St. Augustine, and absorbed their doctrine of one continuous apostolic Church with Divine succession and sacramental powers. By the fourth or fifth century the whole fabric of priestly Christianity was formed which culminated in the Papal system; and the Oxford School, in which Mr. Gladstone grew up, lived and moved in the atmosphere of patristic learning. When dire logical necessity drove Newman and Manning and Hope-Scott—Mr. Gladstone's particular friend—over to Rome, it was thought by many that he would follow. We shall some day learn how far such a course ever crossed his vision, but it is clear that in later life he revolted increasingly from the Papal system. He exposed the shocking cruelty of the prisons of Naples, which was inspired and upheld by the Vatican; and no man ever denounced in more merciless fashion the monstrous claims of Rome when the Infallibility dogma was promulgated than did Mr. Gladstone, in his pamphlets on the Vatican decrees. In later life, while rejecting papalism, and cultivating warm friendship with "old Catholics" like Döllinger, and liberal Catholics like Lord Acton, Mr. Gladstone fell back on Catholic antiquity as it was before the east and west were divided, as most High Churchmen now do. It cannot be denied that the great increase of sacerdotalism in England was largely owing to his appointments, which Lord Salisbury continued, for his Church views were nearly identical. This sacerdotal bias through life prevented Mr. Gladstone doing full justice to the great Puritan movement, and to men like Cromwell, Milton and Hampden, or even, I think, to the enormous religious influence exerted in the following century by Wesley and Whitefield. What I may call the individualism of Christianity did not appeal to him. He had little sympathy with Exeter Hall, and was never present,

far as I remember, at its religious anniversaries. He took no part in Lord Shaftesbury's great work, so far as I know. He believed in liberty rather than philanthropy as the cure for social evils. He took little active part in temperance reforms, though quite willing to give scope to such measures of reform as his party would take up, such, for instance, as Mr. Bruce's far-reaching scheme of licensing reform. But one could see that the bias of his mind did not lie in that direction. He belonged to the school of Cobden and of *laissez-faire* rather than that of social reform. He was educated at Oxford and lived at Hawarden, spending most of his time in his library, far away from the slums of our great cities, and he knew too little of the terrible problems caused by overcrowding, intemperance and vice, and the deadly effect of unchecked competition on the weaker section of mankind. He took no part in the Factory Acts legislation of Lord Ashley (afterwards Lord Shaftesbury), and never fully realized the need of social legislation as some of us did who were trained in great cities.

In my humble judgment Mr. Gladstone's fame would have stood higher had he retired from public life earlier. He made mistakes in his old age from not being in touch with modern thought. It is impossible for the greatest mind to preserve, after fourscore, the quickness of perception which the helmsman requires to guide the ship of state, and there usually come also in old age an impatience of contradiction and a certain imperiousness born of senility. Our political system favours the rule of old men too much, and in my humble judgment threescore and ten should mark the extreme limit of official life. In the great majority of cases mental capacity for administrative work declines after sixty, though the judgment may remain unimpaired till seventy and even later in exceptional cases, but the best work of most men is done before sixty, and the bulk of our executive officers should be chosen earlier.

But Mr. Gladstone's defects were like the spots on the sun: it seems ungracious even to hint at them. He left such a blank by his removal that Parliament has never been the same place to many of us. His passing, and that of Queen Victoria, marked the transition from the nineteenth to the twentieth century, and what greater gift can we ask of God than the repetition of two such monumental lives to guide the British race through the tremendous difficulties that lie before us in the coming century?

The chief legislative work of the Session was the passing of the

Irish Local Government Act. Its course through the House was gilded by the grant of £700,000 a year to Irish local taxation, divided between landlords and tenants, being the equivalent of the grant in aid of agricultural rates in Great Britain. It met general support on all sides of the House, and it has placed Irish local government almost entirely in the hands of the Nationalists, except in the north-east corner of Ulster, where the Protestants predominate. It removes the chief badge of inferiority that appertained to Ireland, yet it cannot be said to have mollified the opposition of the Nationalist party to British policy. Their bitter opposition to the South African War went beyond the bounds of reason, and needlessly flouted British sentiment. The net result of these various concessions to Ireland is disappointing, and seems to point to an incompatibility of temperament which no legislation can remove or seriously lessen. Certainly the Nationalist leaders have not advanced the cause of Home Rule by the line they have taken of late years. The main result has been to place in power by an overwhelming majority the Unionist party, and to strengthen all the imperialistic forces of the Empire.

I was much engaged all this autumn (1898) with the Protestant controversy. I had constant applications to address public meetings, and did so in several parts of Lancashire and North Wales. The newspapers were filled with correspondence on the subject. Even when at Orchill during the Recess I was loaded with correspondence. The season was fine. We had many visitors, and Gordon was the light of the home, devoting himself to their entertainment, as he always did, with very little thought for himself. We little thought it was the last autumn we should have his bright presence. The Bishops' charges in the autumn were deeply interesting. Some came out far more strongly on the Protestant side than they had hitherto done; others minimized the difficulties, and evidently hoped the agitation would die out. Archbishop Temple's series of charges were exceptionally able. Unfortunately, he conceded quite too much on the question of consubstantiation—the Lutheran doctrine, but on most points he stoutly upheld the Protestant view. I was asked to give my views as to the most practical solution of the difficulty with greater freedom than I could do in the debates of Parliament, where the rules of order necessarily limit freedom of speech, and I wrote two letters to the *Liverpool Daily Post* on the subject in October, and published them afterwards in pamphlet form under the title, *Chaos in the Church of England*.

So strong and widespread was the feeling in the country about this time that it seemed not unlikely that the next election would be fought chiefly on this question, but the South African war completely changed the centre of interest, and for a time swept the Church Question out of the arena of party politics. One never can predict how long any public question will hold the field. Nothing is more fickle than the ebb and flow of public opinion, but the three years' respite that South Africa has given to Church questions by no means proves that the people are indifferent. The education debates of this Session (1902) show how deep is the dread that the Anglican schools will be used for teaching anti-Protestant doctrine, and this feeling is as strong among many of the laity of the Church of England as among the Protestant Nonconformists.

I attended this autumn the annual Protestant Congress at Folkestone, which was very interesting. The High Church clergy all absented themselves from it.

CHAPTER XLIII

Death of Gordon

I NOW approach the saddest and most mysterious event of my life, on which I can only touch briefly in a work of this kind. My son and his cousin Arthur were taken into partnership at the end of October. It was an arrangement I had long desired. It promised a hope of perpetuating my name and influence in Liverpool, where he was fast making a name for himself, and where he was gradually taking up the threads of my life-work. I thought it not unlikely that he might ultimately find his way into Parliament, for he had a strong bias for public life, and a knowledge of political affairs not common at his age; but I was desirous that he should have practical knowledge of business life, which is in many ways the best apprenticeship for public service.

I may truly say that both in our firm and among the public there was a cordial desire that my son should take his place among the business community of Liverpool, and when a dinner was given to him and his cousin on their entrance into the firm of Smith, Edwards & Co., the kindest wishes were expressed for their success. The late autumn in Liverpool that year (1898) was very unwholesome. It was unnaturally mild and very damp, and much typhoid spread over the town, and towards the end of November my son became unwell. But we did not apprehend any danger for some time. It was thought to be a case of Russian influenza, or a mild gastric attack. However, his strength declined so alarmingly that we got very uneasy, and at last the dread symptoms of typhoid fever declared themselves. He sank under it with terrible rapidity, and at last "perforation" took place, which is almost always fatal. He was only two weeks in bed, and he died on Sunday morning December 4, just before completing his twenty-eighth year. Shortly before he died he told me that he was far more sorry for me than himself, and that he had no fears. His last words to me were

perform acts of kindness to friends and directions for benefactions to good causes. He never complained, or showed any impatience. I never knew so gentle a sufferer. He seemed absolutely devoid of self-seeking. He cared nothing for money or social consideration, and his one desire was to sweeten my life and help me along its lonely path. He was son and daughter combined, and so sound was his judgment that I could consult him about everything. I never knew a young man so blameless in life and so governed by the sense of duty, and I had fondly hoped that after I was gone he would carry on the work I had tried to do. His influence on young men was remarkable, and the many letters I received revealed such love and esteem for dear Gordon as surprised me. I received on all sides intense sympathy, and I can only believe that in answer to many prayers I was supported during a trial that was enough to break one's heart. Certain it is that on the day of the funeral, December 7, there was a wonderful sense of the Divine presence. Gordon's special friend, Rev. A. J. Doull—then a curate in Leeds, now a vicar in Montreal—and his former schoolfellow in Edinburgh, gave a most touching address, which I reproduce here; and my old friend, Rev. J. J. Muir, of Waterloo, who knew my son from childhood, gave an equally touching address in the chapel of Toxteth Cemetery. There he was laid alongside his mother, to whom he was devotedly attached, in sure and certain hope of a blessed resurrection to life eternal.

MR. DOULL'S ADDRESS.

> What he is now we know not! He will be
> A beautiful likeness of the God that gave
> Him work to do, which he did do so well.
>
> H. COLERIDGE.

No easy task is it to write anything in the nature of a personal tribute to the memory of James Gordon Smith, for any attempt at estimating what he was to his relations and friends must fail in its purpose, and prove miserably inadequate. There was a something about Gordon which you could not and cannot define, a something which charmed you, and impressed you, and elevated you, making you feel the better for being in his presence. It is that something that those who loved him so well will ever cherish as of most precious memory; but it is just that something which you cannot define nor depict.

It was, I believe, his true self, his noble and pure soul speaking to you, influencing you, creating happiness all around it, uplifting all who were brought into contact with it; but we cannot describe it! We can, at best, but imperfectly try to describe some of the mani-

festations of his own real self as shown in his truly beautiful character. A long friendship, which increased and deepened year by year, gave me many opportunities of observing his character, which I here attempt to outline, though I feel that many who read these words knew him far better than I did ; but they will be the first to acknowledge the truth of all I say, as well as those most able to understand how truly difficult is my task, and how necessarily imperfect it must be.

The first, and perhaps in many ways the leading feature of Gordon's character was its simplicity. He was genuine and sincere through and through, and absolutely free from affectation, or false pride, which in too many cases is a common defect amongst those born to occupy positions of wealth and influence, and possessing abilities far beyond the average. He was just the same in his courtesy, consideration and kindness to those in the humblest walk in life, as towards those placed in the very highest position in the State.

The charwoman at Addington Palace said of the late Archbishop of Canterbury, that whenever his Grace met her he always raised his hat to her as if she were a duchess ; and the same was perfectly true of the spirit in which Gordon Smith ever behaved towards every one around him.

But this simplicity showed itself in other ways. It has been remarked, in more than one notice which the press has contained of his death, that his intellectual powers were marvellously developed, and that in naval matters his advice was sought and valued by the naval authorities. This is all perfectly true ; but it is only one side of a truth. If his intellectual powers were marvellously developed, yet there was nothing abnormal about the development, he never ceased to be a boy.

The Navy to him was a boyish hobby, and the great knowledge he possessed about it was due to the fact that even as a boy he felt that if a thing was worth knowing it was worth knowing well. To the last he retained his love for all his boyish pastimes, and nothing ever delighted him more than a harmless and playful joke at some one else's expense !

He combined, as few succeed in doing, the freedom, purity, innocence and joyousness of the child, with the self restraint, chivalry, strength of character and judgment of the man.

This simplicity, combined with his self-denying nature, made him the very best friend in the world. Those who had the great privilege of being amongst the number of his friends know how absolutely unselfish and self sacrificing he was, and he was too simple and sincere to be a man of moods. I believe that in the most literal sense he would have laid down his life for his friends. Of his love and tender devotion to his mother, and his absolute reverence for his father, I do not intend to speak here ; it was ideal in both cases, but only one living person has the right to speak of that now.

Yet in all his intercourse with his nearer and dearer friends, as indeed with all whom he included within that circle called friendship, he was always the same, ever ready to sacrifice himself and his own pleasures

JAMES GORDON SMITH

and desires, always happy if he could make others happy. He never seemed to think of himself; he lived for the sake of others. Nor was this self-sacrificing nature content with spending itself, and being spent, for the good, the pleasure, or the comfort of those merely who might be called his friends; wide as that circle was, it was too narrow to enclose his single purpose of helping others, and it was a characteristic of his dealings with all those whom he came into touch with, either socially or in connexion with any of the objects in which he was interested, that he would take infinite pains to save them trouble, and do any act of kindness for them that he could.

I have known him take a long tedious journey from Leeds to Manchester by a painfully slow Sunday night train, in order to be at his work in Liverpool at 9.30 on Monday morning. Had he slept the night at Leeds, the earliest train on Monday morning that he could conveniently have caught would have taken him into Liverpool forty-five minutes later than the time when he ought to have been at his work. "I must be there," he said, "because others will only have to do the work if I am late."

He could not bear to give any one else additional trouble, though he cared not how much trouble he gave himself.

This last incident leads me to speak of one other strong and leading feature about Gordon, in which the same spirit of self denial was shown forth so completely, I mean his devotion to duty.

I have said that he realized as a boy that whatever was worth *knowing* was worth *knowing well*, equally true is it that in his life he showed that he also believed that what was worth *doing* was worth *doing well*. His work was all done quietly, without any ostentation or fuss, but from the simplest and most common task of daily routine to the most serious and important work ever taken in hand by him, all was done in such a thorough and painstaking manner that success was ensured so far as lay in his power. Pleasure with him never came before duty, and always had to make way for it; and I am equally certain that into many pleasures he entered more from a sense of duty than from any feeling of delight in them.

This noble feature of his character, added to the excellent business capacities which he possessed, would have raised him to a high position in the commercial world, and in the government of the nation, but God had higher work for him to do, and has called him to it.

Of the state of the Faithful Departed we know but little, but this we do know that rest does not mean inactivity; and that the character of the soul which here has learned its first lesson in faithfulness to duty will there be perfected in that virtue, as in all others, until in the fulness of God's time:—

> He will be
> A beautiful likeness of the God that gave
> Him work to do, which He did do so well.

Of Gordon's religion it is very difficult to speak. I cannot do better than quote Mr. Lang's words about his friend Ernest Balfour,

whose death at Ardoch in August of last year was a terrible blow to Gordon as to countless others. "He never obtruded" (his religion). "Its evidences were not any special class of actions, still less any special sort of speech, but simply himself, his whole life and personality. And yet it was real—so real that it cannot be left out in any picture of the man as he truly was; though it was a part of him which his friends felt rather than knew. The beautiful trust and resignation of his last days were no new graces given then for the first time; they were the perfect fruit of an inward life which had been gradually ripening and deepening." Those who knew Gordon will note how wonderfully true of him is the above description. He never talked about his religious opinions, he simply lived the life of a Christian gentleman.

I cannot recall anything he ever said, apart from discussions I often had with him on current ecclesiastical questions; on these we differed as widely as the poles, but except for playful and good natured chaff, he was always most considerate, and keenly anxious not to hurt my feelings.

In a more serious way and on the deepest matters which concern our relationship to God, I cannot remember him ever saying anything; but no one could be much with him and not feel that his whole life was a witness to his deep and sincere religious convictions. He had a great horror of cant, and was naturally most reserved. Religion with him was a thing so precious that it must be lived, not talked about; and in a character so deep and true the life was hidden with Christ in God.

In an age when every one is ready to talk about the most sacred and holy matters with a lightness and fluency which is appalling, and to rush into print with the most dogmatic assertions concerning subjects about which they know nothing; and when few are found ready to practise the virtue of humility and reserve, which prompts even the Seraphim to veil their faces in the presence of God, we can ill afford to lose men of the type of Gordon Smith, men whose words are few, but whose deeds are many.

Gordon's life was, and now may his memory be, a constant reminder of the words of our Blessed Lord: "Not every one that saith unto Me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that *doeth* the will of My Father."

> Faith's meanest deed more favour bears,
> Where hearts and wills are weighed,
> Than brightest transports, choicest prayers,
> Which bloom their hour and fade.
>
> NEWMAN.

As he lived, so he died, confident that he was all right in the keeping and presence of our Blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, to the last thinking of others and giving directions for the bestowal of certain legacies to his friends, more sorry for his beloved father, whom he was leaving, than for himself.

It is not for us to ask, why a life so beautiful and so promising has

been taken from us; that is known to God alone. With Him time is not reckoned, and He judges not the value of a life by the number of years He permits it to labour and toil on earth. We too must model our judgment after that of God, and realize that our Heavenly Father must and does know best. To each He gives a work to do, and when that work is done He calls the soul to higher service.

> For honourable age is not that which standeth in length of time, nor that is measured by number of years.
> But wisdom is the gray hair unto men, and an unspotted life is old age.
> He pleased God, and was beloved of him: so that living among sinners he was translated.
> He being made perfect in a short time, fulfilled a long time: for his soul pleased the Lord.
>
> WISDOM iv. 8, 9, 10, 13, 14.

We shall and must sorrow for the loss we have sustained; but we rejoice that he has left us such a precious legacy as the example of his life.

His life was noble and beautiful because it was a reflection of the life of his Lord and Master. In his simplicity he but reflected the far greater simplicity of One of whom alone it could be said, "He had done no violence, neither was any deceit in His mouth"; in his love for friends and in his life of self-denial we can see something of that love which commands us to "love one another, as I have loved you. Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends"; and in his whole-hearted devotion to duty what else was shown forth but the characteristic of a follower of the eternal Son of God who said of His own Divine mission, "I came down from heaven not to do Mine own will, but the will of Him that sent Me."

For a little we are parted from visible and conscious fellowship with him, but we are the better because of knowing him, and his memory and example will ever live to stir us up to more faithful service and more noble deeds.

A. J. D.

LEEDS,
Christmas, 1898.

[1] I had now to consider what change in my life should be made by the loss of all my earthly hopes, and I saw clearly that I should go on with my public work if for no other purpose than to prevent me brooding over my irreparable loss. I almost felt that my mind would give way unless I compelled myself to work, and so I kept up all my activities, especially on the Church question. *In Memoriam* was again one of my chief sources of consolation.

[1] I add to the Appendix as a memento of my son his last pamphlet published by the Navy League, which many old friends will recognize.

I fancied I saw a likeness between my dear son and **Arthur Hallam**, and these lines were often in my mind :—

When I contemplate, all alone,
The life that had been thine below,
And fix my thoughts on all the glow
To which thy crescent would have grown ;

I see thee sitting crown'd with good,
A central warmth diffusing bliss
In glance and smile, and clasp and kiss,
On all the branches of thy blood ;

* * * * * * *

While now thy prosperous labour fills
The lips of men with honest praise,
And sun by sun the happy days
Descend below the golden hills.

With promise of a morn as fair ;
And all the train of bounteous hours,
Conduct by paths of growing powers,
To reverence and the silver hair ;

* * * * * * *

But I was comforted by the thought that in the next life there may be activities for pure souls, far greater than are possible in this life ; that my son might really be a gainer, not a loser, by his sudden translation.

* * * * * * *

The great intelligences fair
That range above our mortal state,
In circle round the blessed gate,
Received and gave him welcome there ;

And led him thro' the blissful climes,
And show'd him in the fountain fresh
All knowledge that the sons of flesh
Shall gather in the cycled times.

But I remained, whose hopes were dim,
Whose life, whose thoughts were little worth,
To wander on a darken'd earth,
Where all things round me breathed of him.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER XLIV

Session of 1899—Lawlessness in the Church of England—Death of Mr. Thomas Ellis—The Church Discipline Bill—The South African War—Fourth Visit to America

I TOOK a run to Nice before Parliament met, and came back in time to attend two huge meetings on the Church question in the Free Trade Hall, Manchester, and the Albert Hall, London. The last was the greatest demonstration I ever saw. The vast building was packed from floor to ceiling, and most telling speeches were made by Lords Kinnaird, Overtoun, and others, including Austin Taylor, of Liverpool, who came out as one of our best Protestant champions. I found the hall too large for my voice, and have not attempted it again. It appeared at that time as if the whole country were moved, and that the Protestant revival would carry all before it.

Parliament met on February 7, and I put down an amendment to the Address in the following words:—

> And we humbly represent to Your Majesty that having regard to the lawlessness prevailing in the Church of England, some legislative steps should be taken to secure obedience to the law.

I got the second place, the first being secured by Ashmead-Bartlett on the China question. It so happened that the general debate terminated the first day (Tuesday), and Ashmead-Bartlett's turn came on Wednesday afternoon. The sitting then was from 12 to 5.30. It was expected that he would occupy the whole afternoon, and that I would move the adjournment and come on first thing on Thursday. I was not prepared for speaking on Wednesday, but, happily, was in the House with my notes in my pocket, when Bartlett, without giving any notice, suddenly withdrew his motion at a quarter to five, and the Speaker rose to

put the question that the Address be agreed to. Had I not been present the debate on the Address would have collapsed, as no one was ready to continue it, and all the amendments would have been cut out; but, though taken unawares and drowsy with the somnolent condition of the House, which was half empty and only contained a small number of members, interested in the China question, I sprang up and started my speech, meaning to extend it so as to throw the bulk of it into the following day, when I would come on the first thing if speaking when the House rose at 5.30. I got a better House as I went on, and still had half my speech to deliver when the time for adjournment came, and so had another three-quarters of an hour on Thursday in an excellent House. In this way I made the fullest and longest speech I ever did on any subject.

I could not have wished to get a better presentation of the case. The debate lasted the whole day, both in the Lords and Commons, and the newspapers next day were full of nothing else. The whole country was now alive with the question, and had Parliament been then dissolved we should have had the most Protestant assembly returned since the Long Parliament of 1640: To show how entirely this was the case, a strong Protestant Conservative, Mr. Sydney Gedge, carried through the House the following motion on April 11 :—

> That this House deplores the spirit of lawlessness shown by certain members of the Church of England, and confidently hopes that ministers of the Crown will not recommend any clergyman for ecclesiastical preferment unless they are satisfied that he will loyally obey the Bishops and the Prayer Book, and the law as declared by the courts which have jurisdiction in matters ecclesiastical.

The final words were added by Mr. Bartley, another Conservative Protestant churchman. Mr. Balfour was very unwilling to accept them. They implied a condemnation of many recent appointments; yet they were carried by 200 to 14, and in the small minority voted Lord Salisbury's two sons, Lord Cranbourne and Lord Hugh Cecil. Further debates showed the extreme weakness of the Ritualist party in the House of Commons, and it was the same in the Lords, where an equally strong Protestant feeling was shown.

I should mention that at the beginning of the Session our veteran leader, Sir William Harcourt, retired, and his place was tak

by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, who has had a very troublesome and thankless task ever since, though he has manfully persevered in what he considered to be his duty. No one could possibly lead the various sections of the Opposition during the South African War without coming into vehement collision with some section of opinion; and so it has been with Campbell-Bannerman; but now that the war is over, his honesty of purpose is recognized on all sides. We also lost this spring our respected Whip, Mr. Thomas Ellis, one of the finest members that Wales ever sent to Parliament. He was a true Welsh patriot and an absolutely honest politician. He died at the age of forty, soon after his marriage. I occupied his house for two Sessions. It fell to my lot to announce the sad event to a meeting at Rhyl at the Easter recess. I may reproduce the tribute I paid to one who was a personal friend:—

Mr. Samuel Smith, M.P., said he rose to perform the mournful duty of seconding the vote of condolence. This was no ordinary loss they deplored. They had lost not only a political leader, but a man who was revered for his many virtues. Mr. Thomas Ellis was no ordinary man. He had a rare combination of qualities. He possessed not only the Celtic enthusiasm and ideality of purpose, but he had a singularly sound and well-balanced judgment. He gave one the impression of having a large reserve of power. He saw clearly the true aims to be followed, and he steadfastly pursued them. He was not drawn aside to the right nor to the left by mere illusions or will-o'-the-wisps, as many young men were. He was one of the most honest and sincere men who ever entered the political arena. He was altogether free from the petty jealousies and ambitions that cling to most politicians. He had a single eye and followed what he believed was the true interest of the people of Wales, and in a large degree the people of the United Kingdom. He was a fervidly patriotic Welshman. But he was more than that, he was a true British statesman. He had reached a position almost unparalleled for one so young. He was the trusted counsellor of the heads of the Liberal party, and he never betrayed their confidence. He was a man of great discretion. Very few men could keep their balance as he did. He was as simple and as unaffected when Whip of the Liberal Party as when a student at Aberystwyth College. He was by nature a perfect gentleman, as kind and as courtous to peasant as to peer. The strength of his character lay in the deep religious convictions of his pious Welsh home and his early Nonconformist training. No one ever heard a word pass his lips that was unseemly. He wore the white flower of a blameless life; he represented what was best and noblest in the Welsh character, and without disparagement to many other gifted men, he was the most valued and trusted of all the representatives that Wales sent to Parliament. The loss they had

sustained was lamentable—he would not say irreparable. But one consolation remained to his bereaved widow and relatives—he would long live in the memory of his grateful countrymen, and his unspotted character would mould for good thousands of the most promising youth of this generation.

On May 10 we had another important Church debate on the second reading of the Church Discipline Bill, generally called the "Liverpool Bill," introduced by my friend, Mr. Charles McArthur, member for the Exchange Division of Liverpool. The object of this Bill was to provide means for the suspension, and, if need be, the removal, of a clergyman who declined to obey the injunctions of the Prayer Book, after being duly admonished.[1]

The House was crowded. Mr. McArthur opened with an excellent speech, and was warmly supported by several Conservatives. The feeling of the House was, as usual, entirely against Ritualism: Mr. Balfour met it by a dilatory amendment, moved by the Attorney-General, which promised legislation if the Bishops failed to restore order to the Church. By using their whole influence with their followers the Government carried this Amendment, which ran as follows:—

That this House, while not prepared to accept a measure which creates fresh offences and ignores the authority of the Bishops in maintaining the discipline of the Church, is of opinion that, if the efforts now being

[1] The Bill may be summarized as follows:—

I. Offences under the Act: (*a*) designating a service of the Church of England as "mass"; (*b*) requiring private confession; (*c*) introducing illegal ornaments; (*d*) using a church for services or practices not sanctioned by the Prayer Book.

II. Procedure: if a clergyman commits an offence under the Act, any two members of the Church of England living in the diocese may (*a*) warn the clergyman of intention to proceed against him; and on his repeating the offence (*b*) file a complaint at the registry of the diocese. Among other details of procedure, no bishop is to have power of vetoing proceedings under the Act.

III. Jurisdiction: the Court shall consist of a judge of the Supreme Court, appointed by Letters Patent, the judge to have the assistance of an assessor, who shall be (*a*) the bishop of the diocese where respondent holds a benefice; and in all other cases (*b*) the bishop of the diocese where the offences were committed.

IV. The Court shall deliver judgment if respondent be found guilty, such judgment to be served on the respondent and the bishop of the diocese, and the bishop shall inhibit the respondent from discharging clerical functions till the latter undertake not to repeat the offence.

V. If the inhibition continue for three months, the clergyman shall be incapable of holding a benefice for three years.

VI. If three judgments under the Act shall issue against the same clergyman within five years he shall be incapable of holding any benefice, etc., thenceforth.

VII Appeals shall lie to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

made by the Archbishops and Bishops to secure the due obedience of the clergy are not speedily effectual, further legislation will be required to maintain the observance of the existing laws of Church and Realm,

by 312 votes to 154. The Government remain bound by that resolution, and the many churches in London and elsewhere that still openly defy the law are a reminder that they have not fulfilled the pledge then given to the House and the country.

This was the last great debate on this question, for the thick clouds that soon after burst in war were already gathering, and, besides that, means were taken to prevent debates that almost approached to Parliamentary tricks. I was cut out of an amendment to the Address in the following Session by the ruse of putting down a "blocking notice" as it is called, which promised a Bill that had no possible chance of coming on. It has now been ruled that no private member can raise a debate by motion, or on the Address, when a notice has been given by some other member on a similar subject, though it may be for the sole purpose of preventing debate, and may be suggested by the Whips for this very purpose. By strategy of this kind I foresee that it will be difficult or impossible to raise further debates on this burning question till one of our great political parties make it a leading plank in their platform, and bring it forward either in the name of the Government or the Opposition.

All through the spring and summer this year much anxiety was felt about the state of affairs in South Africa. A determined effort was made by our Government to obtain for the "outlanders," or emigrants into the Transvaal, the franchise after five years' residence. A conference was held at Bloemfontein, the capital of the Orange Free State, between President Krüger and Sir Alfred Milner (now Lord Milner), our High Commissioner. Krüger could not be got to make reasonable concessions, and it became increasingly apparent to some of us that the claims made by our Government would not be conceded. The opinion still prevailed in England that Krüger would at last have to give in, if we were firm and resolute. I became very apprehensive that we were drifting into war. I knew too much of Dutch history in South Africa, as well as that of their ancestors in Holland, to believe that they could be easily coerced. We had no opportunity of discussing the question in Parliament, as the Government urged silence while negotiations were pending. I felt that we were gradu-

ally being committed to a policy which meant war if the Boers held out; and seeing no opportunity of otherwise raising the question, I decided to move the adjournment of the House, and prepared a speech. But I received little support from my friends, especially those engaged in the South African trade. They insisted that Krüger would give in if we were firm, and that a motion like mine would only stiffen his opposition and increase the risk of war; and at last I shrank from the issue, and, contrary to my own judgment, abandoned the intention. I never had a chance again: The House did not debate the question till the end of the Session, when we had taken a stand from which it was not possible to recede, and war broke out soon afterwards. As I have already said, I now doubt whether the war could have been avoided; but had we foreseen that it would cost us 22,000 men and 228 millions of money, I think means might have been found to stave off so terrible a scourge. I had no doubt myself that the war would be a protracted and costly one, and never could understand the contemptuous way in which the London press then talked of the resources and determination of the Boers. It is a pity that nations can only learn common sense at the cost of such terrible suffering.

There was little else of much moment to distinguish this Session. The Government passed a useful measure to endow London with municipalities. They created the Board of Education, and they aided Mr. Robson to pass an excellent little Bill which raised the half-time age to twelve, and enabled children in agricultural districts to be kept at school during the winter months to thirteen, instead of eleven, when they often left altogether.

It was not a Session of important legislation, and I was able to leave by August 1. I had many London engagements outside Parliament this year; I may just allude to two or three. I presided at the anniversary of Mr. Charrington's great hall at Whitechapel, said to be the largest mission hall in the world. It was crowded with 4,000 enthusiastic adherents, among whom Mr. Charrington has laboured for twenty-five years with extraordinary success. This beautiful hall has been kept going, if I mistake not, without a day's intermission for twenty-five years, and is often crowded to the door, and its influence is felt all over that district. Mr. Charrington gave up his share in the brewing firm of that name for conscientious reasons, and has been rewarded by building up the largest mission church in London. Whitechapel, though far

in the East End, is a fine, open thoroughfare, full of life and interest; indeed, in some ways more interesting than the monotonous streets in the West End. It is quite a mistake to speak of all the East End of London as a dreary wilderness of brick and mortar. There are in many parts a life and vigour and a spaciousness which compare not unfavourably with the Strand and Piccadilly. Dr. Barnardo's great industrial homes in Stepney Causeway are well worth a visit, and so is Dr. Grattan Guinness' fine training Institute for missionaries in Harley House, Bow, to which I often paid visits. These two Institutes have each done splendid work. One is saving the street Arab and Hooligan class of children: the other is furnishing a cheap, practical and industrial training for missionaries, mainly of the artisan class, for regions like Central Africa, where mechanical skill is as much needed as mental training. Several hundreds of most useful pioneers are scattered all over the world who were trained in Guinness's homes in London and Derbyshire.

I also this year and for some other Sessions frequently attended the great meetings on Sunday evenings at St. James's Hall, where the Rev. Hugh Price Hughes carried on the splendid work of the London West End Mission. I always found the large hall crammed with 2,500 people, to whom Mr. Hughes gave deeply interesting and appropriate addresses, not at all on the conventional mission lines, but with a variety of teaching that kept up constant freshness. The audiences were chiefly of the lower middle class, while Charrington's were more of the working class. Strange as it may seem, it is true that no part of London has a more wretched slum population than the back streets behind Piccadilly and Regent Street, and I sorrowfully add that nowhere in Europe does vice flaunt itself so openly. The Wesleyan Mission, with the aid of a noble band of "sisters," bravely grapples with these terrible evils, and it is a sorrow to many of us that Mr. Hughes's health has given way so much under the strain of this laborious work. He has also lost the help of his able colleague, Rev. Mark Guy Pearse, whose moving addresses were greatly valued.

I omitted to mention that, visiting Scotland for the Whitsuntide Recess, I attended the Free Church Assembly at Edinburgh as a delegate from the English Presbyterian Church, and twice addressed it on the spread of Ritualism in England, and received the thanks of the Assembly. I had not attended it, so far as I remember, since I was a youth at college, forty-five years before,

in the old days of Tanfield Hall, when I was carried away by the eloquence of Duff, Candlish, Cunningham and Guthrie. I was much impressed with the combination of piety and intellectual power shown in that Assembly—the last one special to the Free Church, as the union with the United Presbyterian Church was accomplished in the following year, and the two Churches now form a compact body of 1,600 congregations, raising over one million sterling annually for religious work, all by voluntary gifts—a splendid object-lesson in Christian liberality.

I may also mention that I attended a huge Protestant meeting at Cardiff at the end of July. It was held in the hall put up for the Eisteddfod, and was crammed with 12,000 people. Tickets had been applied for by 32,000 people. It was ably addressed by Lord Wimborne, the Earl of Portsmouth, Canon Fleming and others. I stayed with Mr. John Cory, the well-known philanthropist. There was a complete union at this meeting between evangelical churchmen and Nonconformists, as there was at the great Albert Hall meeting in London.

I had a shorter Autumn recess than usual, as I had offered to go as a delegate to the Pan Presbyterian Congress at Washington at the end of September. This important body meets triennially, and represents the churches of the Presbyterian polity throughout the world. There are some 30,000 congregations in all, of whom the great majority are in the United States (some 12,000), Great Britain and her colonies. They claim twenty-five millions of adherents. I suppose among the Protestant Churches, the Presbyterians come next to the Methodists and Baptists, probably exceeding in number the Anglican and her sister Churches. But it is sadly true that a large section of the Anglican communion now disown the term Protestant, though it is still the appellation of the American and Irish Episcopal Churches. These triennial conferences usually take place either in Great Britain or America.

Just before starting I met with another bereavement in the death of my eldest sister Jane (Mrs. McFarlane), my playmate and schoolfellow in childhood. She had long been in poor health, and I felt her loss keenly. We had much in common. It prevented my sister Jessie accompanying me as had been arranged, but she came out a fortnight after and joined me at New York. I left by the *Etruria* on September 16, with my friend, the Rev. William Hutton. We had a tolerable passage.

On my way out I felt very anxious about the dark prospect in

South Africa. War seemed fast approaching. I foresaw great suffering and loss, and wrote a letter to the press, appealing even at the last moment for a peaceful solution. We had so nearly come to a settlement a few weeks before that it seemed almost criminal to plunge into war. As soon as I landed I posted it at New York. It appeared in the *Liverpool Daily Post*, and I quote from it these paragraphs :—

We shall see South Africa thrown into a caldron of anarchy if this deplorable quarrel ends in war. We shall be obliged to suspend self-government in Cape Colony, for Mr. Schreiner and his cabinet will not aid in subduing the Transvaal. Probably many of the young Dutch farmers in Cape Colony—those not themselves the owners of land—will join their kindred in the Transvaal. It seems more than likely that the Orange Free State will do the same. Lieut.-Colonel J. S. Walker, late of the 42nd Highlanders, who has spent some time in the Transvaal and mastered the military situation, writes to the *Times* that it will need an army of 80,000 men to insure victory. The Boers are the best marksmen in the world ; they all fight on horseback and possess far greater mobility than any European army ; they have the same tough courage which their ancestors showed when they wrested the freedom of the Netherlands from Spain and Alva. In some ways they are not unlike the Ironsides of Cromwell, and they will only be subdued by a heavy expenditure of life which will put many British homes into mourning. In such a war the sympathy of the world will go with the small State fighting for its independence ; all other issues will be forgotten. I can see, from speaking to Americans, that their sympathies are not with us. It would be a dreadful error of policy to chill the good feeling which has sprung up between the English-speaking nations for the sake of overcoming the Transvaal and its 30,000 Dutch farmers.

When the rebellion in Canada took place our relations with the French population then were as strained as they now are with the Dutch, but under the wise statesmanship of Lord Durham a friendly settlement was made which paved the way for the great Dominion of Canada, now presided over by Sir Wilfred Laurier, himself a French Canadian.

I cannot doubt that with patience and forbearance it is possible to bring about fifty years hence, perhaps far earlier, a Dominion of South Africa under the protection of Great Britain as loyal and contented as Canada and Australasia now are. The differences between the British and Dutch races are as nothing compared with those between the British and French Canadians. The Dutch are a kindred race to the English with a similar political and religious history. Holland purchased its independence, both civil and religious, at a tremendous cost ; it has been the birthplace of enlightened jurisprudence and ordered liberty ; it gave us our first constitutional sovereign, William of Orange, who laid well the foundation of that system of blended law and liberty which has made Great Britain the envy of the world. Is it a small thing to

alienate our cousins in Holland, not to speak of the far larger G
Commonwealth of fifty millions? The whole of that vast m
Teutons will be against us in a war with the Transvaal. Probabl
will remain neutral, but it is possible to buy victory too dear.
doubt we can overpower the little Dutch Republic in time, as Na
crushed Hofer in the Tyrol, or as Russia is now treating Finland.
I ask, will this policy help the cause of national arbitration which
Pauncefote inaugurated at the Hague? Would the moral inf
of our country be enhanced by setting the example of refusing ar
tion because the Transvaal is not regarded as a sovereign State?

I grant that Great Britain must be the paramount power in
Africa. We cannot treat the Transvaal as on a level with Franc
Germany; but surely it is not beyond the wit of man to devise
kind of court, which can at least offer suggestions for settlement.

Let me say, in conclusion, I do not seek to excuse President Kr
he is obstinate and reactionary, and is a true reflection of the antiq
ideas which dominate the burghers of the Transvaal. The Outla
have real grievances, and the attitude of the Boers has often
irritating to free-born Britons. Mr. Chamberlain's last Des
is not unreasonable, if read apart from his speeches. Let us
urging those claims, and avoid irritating language. It is only a que
of time till this matter settles itself. A little kindly feeling
wonderfully smooth the way for settlement. "Blessed are the p
makers, for they shall be called the children of God."

But the die was practically cast then, as the Boer ultim
was launched about this time, and after that all negotiation
impossible. It now seems as though Krüger and Steyn had
made up their minds to fight, believing that with the aid o
Cape Colony Dutch they could expel us from South Africa.

They counted on a force, including the Cape Dutch, of 8
or 90,000 men, all mounted, and far more mobile than our infa
They had accumulated an enormous store of munitions of
and as our garrisons in South Africa were but small when
ultimatum was launched, their calculations were not so unre
able. Besides, they were undoubtedly under the impression
Germany would in some way make a diversion in their fa
Altogether the outlook was very bad at the beginning of the
and we need not wonder that misfortune after misfortune ma
its earlier stages.

My visit to America on this occasion was different from al
others. It was mainly for a religious object, and I was bro
more into contact with its religious life than on any other
sion.

From New York I went to Philadelphia to attend a

given by the Historic Society of that city to the foreign delegates to the Convention. We were treated with the greatest hospitality, as is the invariable rule in America, and very interesting and most kindly speeches were made as became the "city of brotherly love," founded by William Penn and his Quaker associates. I had the opportunity of speaking on the essential unity of the Anglo-Saxon race, our common ancestry and our common faith. Indeed, it is true that I have often felt in the United States that Protestant Nonconformists are more at home there than in England. They inhale an atmosphere which is practically universal in America, but confined to half the population in England. It is, in fact, almost identical with the religious atmosphere of Scotland. Absolute religious equality obtains, not merely political, but social. There is no stigma such as is implied in the words "Dissenter," or "Nonconformist," as used in England. There is no State Church, with its assumption of superiority, and no proselytizing by means of social attractions. Religion stands on its own footing—a matter of individual conviction, and a refreshing manliness and independence characterize the best life of America.

I never fully realized till I attended the Alliance meetings in Washington how identical were the Presbyterian Churches all over the world (and the same applies to the other Protestant denominations). Whether British, Canadian, Australian or American delegates spoke, they were of one family. The speech, the very accent was the same. The habits of thought, the modes of expression, the slight doctrinal variations, the grand moral and spiritual unity—all bespoke the product of one common life, moulding them into oneness. This of course did not apply in the same degree to the Continental delegates, but they were in a small minority. Our President, Dr. Marshall Lang (now Principal of Aberdeen University), filled the chair with dignity. Our meetings were held in the church which Abraham Lincoln attended to the day of his death, and his pew was marked by a dark line of colour.

I found the meetings very interesting—not so much for the subjects discussed, which were sometimes rather trite, as for the opportunity of forming friendships with men of real worth and wide experience. I got an excellent opportunity of addressing the Alliance on the spread of sacerdotal doctrine in England, and found our American friends comparatively ignorant of the subject. They did not regard it as a real danger in America. The Episcopal Church has a certain leaven of it both in the United States

and Canada, but it is not taken seriously by the laity, and but a small section of the American people (though a wealthy and influential one) belong to that Church. The vast mass of the Protestant population of America correspond with the Scotch and Irish Presbyterians and the English Nonconformists. A most interesting paper, read by Dr. Roberts, one of the secretaries of the Alliance, gave us an estimate of the religious composition of the Colonial population, which numbered three millions on the attainment of independence. He put the Presbyterians at 900,000, mostly of Scotch or Scotch-Irish descent; the English Puritans at 600,000; and the French and Dutch Huguenots at 400,000. The colonial population and their descendants formed the staple of the American people until the Irish famine in 1847 sent large numbers of poor Irish Catholics across the Atlantic. The German emigrants began to pour in about twenty years later, and in the last twenty years a vast number of Italians, Poles, Hungarians and Russians—many of these Jews. America can no longer be spoken of as a homogeneous, Protestant, Anglo-Saxon country. Yet the original impress remains far more strongly than might be expected. The literature of the country is still markedly Puritan; also the better part of the secular press, and the influence of the pulpit and religious press is enormous. The dominant ruling class in the United States is the offspring of the old colonial stock from which almost all the Presidents are taken. The great industrial enterprises are chiefly in their hands, and, above all, the atmosphere of thought is generated by them. That atmosphere envelopes the European emigrant from the time he lands; the common school forms his children into American citizens; and in spite of the great intermixture of race and language, a real continuity exists between the Pilgrim Fathers and the great body of the American people to-day. The Englishmen regarded with reverence in America to-day are Cromwell, Hampden, Milton, Bunyan, Penn and Robinson. Their spiritual ancestors are Calvin and Knox, Baxter and Howe, Wesley and Whitefield. You cannot visit their churches without feeling the throbbing of the same life, and even the large Roman Catholic population that pours into America gets wonderfully liberalized, and a large proportion of its descendants ultimately passes into the Protestant communions. The genius of America is most unfavourable to priestly pretensions, and I find that the closest observers in that country, men like Dr. Josiah Strong, were more afraid of the wild immoral heresies

THE CAPITOL, WASHINGTON

Photo by Frith & Co., Ltd

like Mormonism or Spiritualism, which were rapidly spreading in the far west, than of priestly or sacerdotal domination.

America has dangers of its own, different from those of Europe, and the chief one is the growth of anti-Christian and anti-social movements in that strange conglomerate of races which is filling up the vast regions beyond the Mississippi. There is not in these new States that foundation of solid religious life laid by the Puritans in the Eastern States, and there is far more danger both politically and socially in the trans-Mississippi region than in the old, settled States of the East.

We received much hospitality in Washington. We were courteously entertained by President McKinley, himself a deeply-religious man, and were taken a delightful excursion up the Potomac to Mount Vernon, the picturesque home of Washington. We witnessed the triumphal reception of Admiral Dewey, fresh from his victory at Manila; and, above all, we admired the beauty of Washington itself—its magnificent buildings, its public parks and squares, its broad avenues and its palatial mansions, inhabited by the *elite* of American society. One cannot but feel that Washington is destined to be one of the finest cities in the world, and it already possesses in its Capitol and Congressional library two of the finest edifices in existence.

Early in October I returned to New York to meet my sister and take part in an interesting Presbyterian function there, and then went on by appointment with Professor De Witt to Princeton University, to address the students of theology on the sacerdotal movement in England. Princeton is the Mecca of Calvinistic theology in America. The whole university is still essentially Presbyterian. Its former President, the famous Dr. McCosh, was an Irish Presbyterian minister, and the two Hodges, father and son, especially the older, were the greatest Presbyterian divines of the last century. I had the college chapel filled with the students and their professors, including Dr. Patten, the Principal, and got a fine opportunity of putting the case before an assembly of rising men. My sister and I were hospitably entertained, and met several of the professors and went over the principal colleges, which are sprinkled through the virgin forest in Arcadian simplicity, without any town, scarcely even a village, in the vicinity. The wonderful autumnal hues on the foliage were in their full glory. I never saw anything finer. The whole picture was one of idyllic repose, and we left Princeton filled with happy memories.

A meeting of a very different kind I attended in Carnegie Hall, New York, to protest against the South African War. It was got up chiefly by Irish Americans and descendants of the old Dutch settlers of New York—for the city was originally a Dutch settlement. The prevailing sentiment was very adverse to Great Britain, yet a minority, mostly English, I fancy, strongly dissented from most of the speeches. I may say that on the whole the press of New York was very fair on this question. There was nothing like the bitterness to England exhibited at the election of 1896 when I was in America before. Our friendly attitude during the war with Spain made a deep and, I think, a permanent impression on American opinion, and never since then has there been anything approaching the ill-temper developed on the Venezuelan question. The conciliatory action of our late ambassador, Lord Pauncefote, under Lord Salisbury's wise guidance, has done much to foster good feeling between the two nations. Yet I must say that the mass of the Americans, being Republicans, sympathized with the Boer Republics, and the South African War put a strain on our friendly relations with the United States, which I was sorry to see.

We also paid a brief passing visit to Yale University, also beautifully situated amid woods gorgeous with autumn tints, but lying close to the ugly town of Newhaven. We then went on to Boston, seeing the grand reception given there to Admiral Dewey, and paying a brief visit to Harvard University, the largest, I suppose, in the United States. It is in a suburb of Boston called Cambridge. We stayed at the same hotel with D. L. Moody, who was holding a mission in the Tremont Temple, the spacious church of Dr. Lorimer, one of the leading Boston ministers. Mr. Moody was still as active as ever, but did not look healthy, and suddenly died two months after. I had some pleasant intercourse with him. He had with him Campbell Morgan, of London, a like-minded man, who has since then settled at Northfield, Mr. Moody's home, and the seat of his large schools and training institutions.

From Boston we went to Montreal and went over the McGill university—a noble institution. The finest science college there cost half a million sterling, and was the gift of one of the citizens. I saw the late venerable Principal, Sir William Dawson, on what proved to be his death-bed. He was the most able scientist in Canada, and had done more than any one else to build up the McGill University. He spoke with the simplicity of a child of



QUEBEC

Photo by Photochrom Co

his Christian faith. He had found no contradiction between science and Christianity. He died soon after.

We paid a brief visit to Quebec, staying in the Frontenac Hotel, the view from which, on the Dufferin Terrace, is one of the finest in the world. I would rank Quebec as the most picturesque city I ever saw. We also took a short run to Ottawa, and then visited that prosperous city, Toronto, where I lectured to the students of Knox College, under their venerable President, Principal Caven, and saw the first Canadian regiment fitting out for the war with great enthusiasm. Then we visited Niagara Falls and Buffalo, and returned to New York for the *Teutonic*, in which we made a fast but stormy passage home.

One concluding reflection I will make on this, my last, visit to America. The contrast with 1896 was wonderful. Then the country was full of labour wars, industrial distress, and socialism. Now it was amazingly prosperous, and all the social friction had vanished. So it has remained ever since; but I venture to predict that when the ebb tide sets in, as it certainly will again, the popular movement against these huge monopolies styled "Trusts," "Syndicates" or "Combines," will revive, and assume dimensions that will threaten the peace of the country.

This was the last of my long journeys (except one up the Nile to Assouan in 1901), which covered in all about 90,000 miles.

We arrived in England during a period of intense gloom. The war in South Africa had opened with a succession of misfortunes. Some of these we heard of before we left the shores of America, and all the way home we were oppressed with anxiety. The Boers greatly outnumbered our forces in the early part of the war, and succeeded in locking up our principal army in Ladysmith, and also besieged Kimberley and Mafeking. As soon as our reinforcements poured in, attempts were made to relieve these places, but without success, and in the second week of December three repulses took place with heavy losses. The nation felt humbled at its ill success against an enemy it had despised. The Boers proved themselves far better adepts at strategy than our generals. They concealed their men under cover and mowed down our troops, who rushed on in the old British style suited to the days of "Brown Bess," but madness as against repeating rifles. It seemed for a time as if we had lost our prestige. All over the Continent an outburst of passion against this country took place. Its focus and centre was in Germany, but it was found every-

where. A combination against us seemed only too probable. The country was denuded of troops, and only the strength of our fleet deterred our jealous rivals from attempting an invasion. I do not remember a darker time since the horrors of the Crimean winter or the Indian Mutiny.

But one effect was to stir up an extraordinary wave of patriotism. Volunteers offered themselves in great numbers to go to the seat of war, and this not only from the mother country, but from all the colonies. We had found in Canada, and especially in Ontario, the most fervid patriotism. The same spirit was shown in Australasia, and the Britons in South Africa volunteered almost *en masse*. Before we were far into the next year 150,000 men were in South Africa or on their way there, and the venerable Earl Roberts, who had just lost his only son at Colenso, took command, with Kitchener as Chief of the Staff.

To add to the gloom of this terrible winter, another awful famine broke out in India. It steadily increased in intensity and area during the spring and summer of 1900, till at last sixty millions of people were affected, and six millions wholly fed by the Government. It was the worst famine known for a century, and coming just three years after the great famine of 1897 on a weakened population who had not recovered health or vitality, its deadly effect was doubled. It did seem as though the Divine displeasure rested on our land, and I urged through the press the appointment of a day of humiliation and prayer.

It was in this state of things that Parliament met in 1900.

CHAPTER XLV

Session of 1900—The Church Question—The Indian Famine—Reflections on India—Plays and their Supervision—Clericalism in Voluntary Schools—Condition of the Streets of London—National Defence—National Religion—Conclusion

I HAD prepared with much care an amendment to the Address raising the Church question, bringing up to date the progress of Ritualism, and the action or inaction of the bishops as regards the restoration of discipline. I had a sharp attack of influenza after returning from Nice in January, and felt under par at the opening of the Session, yet I managed to get the first place for the following amendment to the Address:—

> And we humbly represent to Your Majesty that a state of lawlessness still prevails in the Church of England; that doctrines and practices rejected at the Reformation are still largely prevalent; that the Bishops still interpose their veto on prosecutions; and that the time has come to redeem the pledge given by the House of Commons in 1899 and accepted by the present Government, that "if the efforts now being made by the Archbishops and Bishops to secure the due obedience of the clergy are not speedily effectual, further legislation will be required to maintain the observance of the existing laws of Church and Realm."

It was evident, however, that the interest of the House was no longer in any domestic question. Several days were occupied with debates on South Africa. Then balloting for private members' Bills took place. As usual, some 300 or 400 were introduced, of which never more than one or two can pass into law, nor can more than twelve or fifteen obtain a second reading debate. Yet it is now ruled that if notice is given of a Bill on any subject even when there is not the faintest chance of bringing it forward, it bars any motion on that subject either on the Address or during

the Session. By this ruse my amendment was ruled out of order, and probably the same plan will be adopted in future to stop these troublesome Church debates. It seems to me that now the discussion must be transferred from the arena of Parliament to the country, and it will only be ripe for Parliament when one of the two great political parties take it up as a national question. The Government alone can legislate with any effect, but on the demand of the Leader of the Opposition a day is always given by the Government to debate a question which involves a vote of censure. We have not yet reached the stage where such a line is likely to be taken, but it may be nearer than some think. I had my speech printed, however, and over 100,000 copies have been circulated through the country, largely by the Protestant societies. I make a quotation from the speech to show how far Mr. Balfour, our present popular Prime Minister, admits the gravity of the case. It is taken from an article contributed by him to the *North American Review* of December, 1899. It concedes all that I have advanced in Parliament and out of it, except that he says "a relatively small" part of the High Church Party hold these doctrines. The best answer to this is that on June 21, 1900, the English Church Union, containing 4,000 clergy, unanimously adopted the following resolution as respects the Archbishop's decision at Lambeth, on the subject of the Reservation of the Sacrament. Mr. Balfour's statement and the Resolution of the English Church Union are as follow :—

A section (I believe a relatively small one) of the High Church clergy seem bent on proving their Catholicism by embodying as much of Ritual and observing as much of the Roman doctrine as is compatible with remaining in a communion which the Church of Rome has declared to be schismatic. . . . I do not charge them with Romanizing, but I do charge them with a desire so to alter, both in its forms and in its spirit, the traditional character of the Church to which they belong, as to make it practically unrecognizable by its most distinguished and most loyal sons for three centuries ; and I hold that this desire, however honourable in its motives, however disinterested, and I believe it to be both honourable and disinterested, is not consistent with loyalty to the Church of England. . . . They are the people who, like Lord Halifax, and those who follow Lord Halifax, make no secret of the fact that they regard the history of the Church of England for the last three centuries as an unprofitable parenthesis in the history of the Church Universal, and who frankly admit that they would like to see the ritual of the Church modified in a sense which would bring it, if not into lute conformity, at any rate into very close agreement with the

which existed in the Church of Rome in the immediate pre-Reformation days. I think I am not distorting the sense of the English Church Union declaration.

DECLARATION OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH UNION

We, the members of the English Church Union, holding fast to the faith and teaching of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper the bread and wine, through the operation of the Holy Ghost, become (1), in and by consecration, according to our Lord's institution, verily and indeed (2) the body and blood of Christ, and that Christ our Lord, present in the same most Holy Sacrament of the altar under the form (3) of bread and wine, is to be worshipped and adored (4), desire in view of present circumstances to reaffirm in accordance with the teaching of the Church, our belief in this verity of the Christian faith, and to declare that we shall abide by all such teaching and practice as follow from this doctrine of the whole Catholic Church of Christ.[1]

To which I may add that several Ritualistic societies are even more Romish than the English Church Union, and certainly the numbers of the clergy who belong to these societies cannot be less than 7,000, or about one-third of all the beneficed clergy and their curates in the National Church.

As the spring went on affairs in South Africa came to look much brighter. Lord Roberts, by splendid generalship, drew off the Boer force from Ladysmith, and relieved the half-famished garrison, causing intense joy in the country. Cronje, with 4,000 Boers, surrendered at Paardeburg, and soon after Kimberley and Mafeking were relieved, and a little later on Pretoria was occupied. The sense of relief was very great, and services of thanksgiving were held in the churches; but we were reminded of the cost of

[1] I append the definition of the Mass as given by the Council of Trent to show how little difference there is between the declaration of the English Church Union and the authoritative creed of Rome to-day:—

"If any one shall deny that in the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist there are contained truly, really and substantially the body and the blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and therefore whole Christ, and shall say that He is in it only by sign, or figure, or influence, let him be accursed" (Canon I. on the Eucharist).

"If any one shall say that in the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist there remains the substance of bread and wine along with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and shall deny the wonderful and singular conversion of the whole of the substance of the bread into the body, and the whole of the substance of the wine into the blood, there remaining only the appearance of bread and wine, which conversion the Catholic Church most appropriately calls Transubstantiation, let him be accursed" (Canon II. on the Eucharist).

the war by the addition of twelve millions to the taxation of the country, and the addition of forty-three millions to the National Debt.

I may mention here that I had a curious presentiment all through this Session that it might be the last I would have for serious work. I never recovered from my attack of influenza. I felt my strength declining, and shrank from heavy Parliamentary work, yet I was impelled to make a last effort to bring before Parliament some subjects in which I was deeply interested, and I was wonderfully favoured with opportunities. The war had swept away much interest in domestic questions. Very little legislation was on hand. Few private members were balloting for motions. The Irish members were still divided amongst themselves, and not balloting for Irish questions as they now do in one united phalanx, and so I was enabled four times to secure a good place in the ballot (as I did in 1889) for questions of great importance!

The first of these was on the Indian Famine. I secured it in the name of my friend, Sir William Wedderburn, for Tuesday, April 3, and he moved and I seconded the following motion:—

That, in view of the grievous sufferings which are again afflicting the people of India, and the extreme impoverishment of large masses of the population, a searching enquiry should be instituted in order to ascertain the causes which impair the cultivators' power to resist the attacks of famine and plague, and to suggest the best preventive measures against future famines.

I reproduce most of my speech (as reported) being the last I made on India—I may say "my final will and testament" on a subject that has occupied much of my thoughts for forty years. I said:—

I rise with much pleasure to second this motion. I do not pretend to the intimate knowledge of India that my hon. friend possesses, but I am not second to him in my deep interest in the welfare of its population. It is plain that this is the most awful famine of the century, and I am told by persons who know the facts well that, in spite of the utmost efforts made by the Government, and the indefatigable self-sacrificing efforts of our Indian administrators, some millions of people will perish, and that it will cost the Government of India eight and a half millions sterling. One who knows India well stated in my hearing that he believed as many lives would be lost as in the great Madras famine, namely, five millions.[1] People hardly realize what these gigantic figures mean. Perhaps the House will allow me to read two

[1] Owing to the splendid efforts of the Government the mortality was much less.

short extracts from letters describing what the writers saw with their own eyes. The first letter is dated, "Agra Medical Missionary Institution, February 27, 1900," and is written by the Rev. D. Colin S. Valentine—

"On Sabbath morning we had upwards of 3,500 poor creatures, to whom as usual we preached and distributed alms. There were many cases that pained me to the heart, and which when once seen can never be forgotten. Hundreds of poor houseless, homeless creatures are flocking in from the Native States, where even the drinking water has left the wells. The accounts of the suffering from those parts of the country are truly heartrending, parents actually eating their own children. While all parts of the community are suffering, the young widows and children are the greatest sufferers. It is most pitiable to see the trying little creatures lying in their mothers' arms, far more skeletons than living creatures. Of course, those are dying by thousands. In some respects the condition of the young Hindu widows is even more sad. . . ."

The second letter is by Mr. L. E. Marks, written from Ajmere, in Rajputana, on February 26, 1900—

"The suffering is fearful. In many places dead bodies may be seen lying here and there. Mr. Inglis has just returned from the very worst district, and tells me that it was a common sight to see bodies being devoured by dogs, and that he and Dr. Huntly took a walk one evening and counted forty bodies, and on other evenings twenty, thirty-three, and so on. He could not go through a field without seeing several skeletons by the wayside, the bones bleaching in the sun. The Famine Commissioner saw thirty bodies in a ravine in different stages of decomposition. We hear many other such stories, and we have seen sufficient to believe it all."

I need not harrow the House with more details of the same kind. This state of things prevails over a great district inhabited by 40 millions of people, and a lesser degree of famine prevails among 20 millions more. I think the country hardly realizes it, and I am sure a larger response would be made to the Mansion House Fund if the citizens of London knew the real state of things. There is much that the Government cannot do. It gives a bare subsistence to those who come to the relief works, but it cannot search out the high-caste women and children who would rather die than defile themselves by labouring with the lower castes. The cattle also have perished to a fearful extent. In one district of Rajputana 90 per cent. have died, and I am told half of all the splendid breed of cattle in Guzerat, the garden of Western India, have perished. But our object in this debate is to search for remedies, or preventive measures to alleviate the effects of famines which have now become more and more frequent. The House could not consider a more important question, for the war in South Africa must not blind us to the paramount importance of other questions. I believe there is one remedy, and only one, which can to a large extent mitigate famines: I refer to water storage and irrigation. No doubt some splendid works have been carried out on the basins of the great rivers,

like that of Sir Arthur Cotton in the delta of the Godavery, where two millions of people now live in comfort in place of half a million of indigent, half-starved peasants. But we have done little beyond the river bottoms, and the great mass of the Indian population does not live in the river deltas. The famine is mainly in districts like Guzerat, the Central Provinces, and Rajputana, where rivers are scarce, and canal irrigation fed by rivers is often impossible; but in these districts the configuration of the country often lends itself to forming reservoirs during the rainy season. There are low hills with valleys or nullahs down which torrents of water rush during the monsoon, and where by damming up the watercourses there could often be obtained at small expense an artificial lake which would irrigate by small canals all the surrounding country. It is morally certain that if we had spent as much on irrigation as on railways in the past fifty years a great part of India would by this time have been beyond the reach of famine. We have spent some 300 millions on railways and only some 30 millions on irrigation. We are spending scarcely one million a year on irrigation and eight or ten millions on railways. Has not the time come to make irrigation our principal task? We have made Egypt what it is by irrigation works; let us now try India. The crux of all those tropical countries is to get water. As John Bright truly stated—

"What you hear of as the calamity of India is that there is famine and that the famine arises from drought; that there is a lack of water, or at least a lack of water in the right place and at the right time. Now, what is the remedy? Our Government knows very well what the remedy is; because what do they do? Whenever there is a famine they begin to think about some manner of irrigating that particular district. They generally wait until the horse is stolen before they lock the stable door. Colonel Chesney says, 'The Ganges Canal was the outcome of the great famine of 1833, the new project in the Doab of the famine of 1861; the Orissa works of that of 1866. Oude has escaped famine so far, and in the Oude no irrigation works have been constructed.' He goes on to say that the Indian Government is very like a father who spends a great deal on the doctor or the nurse if his child is ill and ready to die, but in ordinary times does not take the smallest care of him whatever, or teach him anything with regard to the preservation of his own health."

Our true policy is to place an engineer of great eminence at the head of this department with as much power as Sir Colin Scott Moncrieff had in Egypt; give him a competent staff and a free hand for twenty years. I believe such a policy would revolutionize India. Unhappily there is no section of the British public sufficiently interested to press the Government on this subject; but there is a powerful interest always pressing them on the subject of railways. The great iron trade and the engineering profession bring pressure, which it is hard to resist, on every Indian Secretary, and practically his whole borrowing power is used up in this direction. Then the Viceroys and the Provincial Governors do not remain long enough to gauge the situation so as to carry out a great policy. Above all things, continuity of policy is what

is needed ; and I would venture the suggestion that where a Viceroy like Lord Curzon shows exceptional capacity, and masters a huge problem like that of irrigation, he should get a second term of office. His value would be double to India in his second term of office. There is nothing India needs so much as a strong continuous policy. A benevolent despotism suits Asiatics best, and therefore when native States happen to have a good ruler he is almost worshipped by the natives. What India wants is a modern Akbar. But irrigation is not a panacea ; it is not applicable to all or nearly all the surface of India ; and even if it were it would not give an assured position to the Indian cultivators without moderate and fixed assessments of the land. India is a country of rural villages. It has few industries ; 80 per cent. of the people live on the soil. The manual industries it used to have, such as hand-loom weaving, embroidery and brass work, have almost been extinguished by our cheaper manufactures, and millions of small artificers are now thrown on the soil for maintenance. The countless millions of small cultivators in India are excessively poor. Most of them are hopelessly in debt to the money-lenders ; and when a famine year occurs they have no resources to fall back upon. When in India I met with the greatest complaints about the land assessments. The natives insisted that they were heavily over-assessed, and when the settlement arrived they were in a state of terror, and had to bribe the corrupt native under-officials to get a fair return made to the revenue officer. I notice that large additions have recently been made to the land assessments. The Central Provinces are the poorest part of India ; they are suffering terribly from this famine, as they did from the last one three years ago, and I ask the House to listen to what a very able civil servant, Mr. Romesh Dutt, says about them—

"In many districts in the Central Provinces the Government demands and obtains 60 per cent., plus 12½ per cent. as rates, of the landlords' supposed assets. And as the landlords never get the high rents which the Government has fixed, it comes to pass that the Government demand amounts sometimes to 80 or even 100 per cent. of the landlords' real income. I have instances before me in which landlords have offered to surrender their property, because the Government revenue demanded from them was really more than all they collected from cultivators."

That is a very bad condition of things.

The Secretary of State for India (Lord G. Hamilton, Middlesex, Ealing) : I have an explanation to give.

Mr. Samuel Smith : I have frequently discussed the matter with Mr. Dutt, and I know of nobody who has a more thorough grasp of the question than he appeared to have. The case of Madras is also very bad. The Government there demands one-half the net produce of the soil, which is not to exceed one-third of the gross produce, with the result that great numbers of harsh evictions take place for non-payment of rent.

Lord G. Hamilton : May I ask the hon. Member what authority he is now quoting from ?

Mr. Samuel Smith : I am quoting from Mr. Romesh Dutt and Mr. Rogers, who have both carefully studied the case of Madras.

Lord G. Hamilton : I do not wish to interrupt the hon. Member, and all I desired was to get at the source of his information.

Mr. Samuel Smith : Mr. Rogers is an old civil servant.

Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree (Bethnal Green, N.E.) : Is the hon. Member now quoting Mr. Rogers' own words ?

Mr. Samuel Smith : No ; I am not giving his exact words, but I will now give Mr. Rogers' figures. I find that in the last eleven years 151,000 cultivators were sold up by the Government ; and I am informed that in the eleven years previously, when the cultivators were extremely impoverished by the awful famine in 1876, there were no fewer than 840,000 defaulters. Mr. Rogers obtained those figures for me, and they were taken from Government sources. Such a state of things stands self-condemned. It is quite impossible that the Indian peasantry can be prosperous under such a state of things. Need we wonder that the great bulk of them are hopelessly in debt to the money-lender, who sometimes charges them 3 per cent. per month interest ? The number of evictions every year in India is appalling, and the question is, how are we to improve the condition of the peasantry of India ? We shall have to devote our attention to that problem, or else we shall have troubles in that dependency. If the House thinks I am over-stating the case I will make a quotation from a source which the House generally will admit is absolutely reliable. I will quote from Sir James Caird. When he came home from Madras, about the year 1878, he put the whole case in a nutshell. Sir James Caird says—

" The right of the cultivator to mortgage the public land has made him the slave of the money-lender. Government rent must be paid on the day it becomes due. It is rigorously exacted by the officials, and as the money-lender is the only capitalist within reach, the cultivator gives a charge on the land, and hands over all his crop as a security for cash advances."

That is the condition of the great majority of the Indian peasants who are hopelessly in the hands of the money-lenders, and they have neither money nor credit to fall back upon. The people of this rich country do not realize the excessive poverty of India, where in the best of times the average income is £2 per head per annum, against £36 in Great Britain. Lord Lawrence himself states—

" The mass of people in India are so miserably poor that they have hardly the means of subsistence. It is as much as a man can do to feed his family, or half feed them, let alone spending money on what you would call luxuries or conveniences."

I am convinced that the two great means of raising the material condition of the Indian people are an extended system of irrigation and a moderate land settlement, as far as possible fixed and permanent. The most prosperous part of India is Bengal, where Lord Cornwallis gave a permanent settlement at the close of last century. It was a mistake to confine it to the zemindars or large landlords, and it has been necessary to pass various Acts to secure fixity of tenure and fair rents

for the cultivators as well. But the broad fact remains that Bengal is more prosperous and less troubled with famines than any part of India. Lord Canning recommended a permanent settlement of the land all over India. This was not adopted ; but of late years the settlements have in many parts been made for shorter periods than thirty years in order to squeeze more revenue. The expense of governing India is too great for so poor a population, and it prevents the Government dealing with the land of Inda as the true interests of the people require. I do urge the importance of consulting more fully Native opinion on this subject. The rulers of India, with the best intentions, are too much up in a balloon. Why do they not call to their aid some of the ablest of their Native administrators, such as Romesh Dutt, who retired from the Indian Civil Service after a most honourable career, and whose work on India is full of wisdom ? There is a vacancy on the Indian Council at present ; why not fill it with such a man as Mr. Dutt, so that the Secretary for India may have the power of consulting a native of India on points which natives alone can perfectly understand ? I much fear we may go on as we are doing till some catastrophe wakens us up like that in South Africa. The government of India is a gigantic problem. It is full of difficulties and dangers little dreamt of here, and the time has come when Parliament must face those difficulties or plunge into a sea of troubles. I beg to thank the House for listening to me so patiently.

Since then I have hardly been able to attend any Indian debates in Parliament, but I have followed them with much interest, and was specially struck with the powerful speech of my friend, W. S. Caine, in February this year (1902). I have also read that excellent book on the Indian land system by Mr. Romesh Dutt, and most of Mr. William Digby's recent huge volume on the poverty of India. He weakens a good cause by needless asperity and incessant attacks on the Government of India, but the facts he gives from official statistics and returns made to Government are of the gravest kind, and demand the most serious attention of all true statesmen. Lord Curzon's estimate of the average income of the Indian peasantry (five-sixths of the whole population) of twenty rupees, say £1 6*s*. 8*d*. per annum, is enough to justify the most pessimistic views. It shows that a state of semi-starvation is chronic among vast masses of the people. Probably the lowest class of labourer in Ireland, or Italy, or Spain, or Russia cannot subsist on less than £4 per head of his family per annum, or three times as much as the income per head of the Indian population.

But the Indian peasantry are deeply and hopelessly in debt to the money-lenders, and the burning question of the day is how to extricate them. I will venture to suggest one more solution of

this terrible difficulty. The debts of the Indian peasantry are roughly estimated by Mr. Caine at 230 millions sterling. No doubt it is largely guess-work, but it might be possible to ascertain it if some way could be devised of making a composition and final settlement. The debtors are in many cases hopelessly insolvent. Their little holdings are mainly worked for the benefit of the money-lender. They have to hand to him all the produce after paying their rent, and he allows them just enough to keep body and soul together—in years of scarcity not even that. They pay interest, never less than twelve per cent. per annum—often far more. That is to say, the annual charge to the usurer payable by the agricultural class must be twenty-five to thirty millions sterling a year, against eighteen millions of land revenue, which is the Government charge. If they could be freed from this crushing tax to the money-lender, it would put life and hope into scores of millions of the gentlest, most patient, and suffering people in the world.

How is it to be done? We have devised an easy means in this country for the relief of insolvent debtors. Why should we not extend the principle to India? It was acted on in some special districts such as the Deccan, several years ago, after riots against the money-lenders. I would suggest that a commission be appointed to tabulate the entire agricultural debt of India, and write it down to an amount which the peasantry could fairly be expected to pay. Much of it has already been paid up equitably in the shape of usurious interest. Some of it has been paid up two or three times over if interest were reckoned at five per cent. I think the creditors would be amply repaid by a cash settlement of two-thirds of the nominal amount, say 150 millions sterling. But where is the Government to find this huge sum? I would suggest that it follow the precedent of the Irish Land Act and pay by Government stock at the market value of the day. The creditor may be asked to take stock at a price which he can sell at in the market. The three per cent. stock sells at par. 150 millions at three per cent. gives four and a half millions annually. If to this a sinking fund of one per cent. be added to pay the debt gradually, the total charge on the peasantry would be six millions a year instead of the twenty-five or thirty millions which they owe to the money-lenders; and the whole revenue assessment would be twenty-four millions a year in place of eighteen, which it is at present, and the peasantry would be limited to this charge, instead

of forty to fifty millions, which they owe at present for rent and interest combined. Of course there are immense difficulties in such a scheme. Chief among these are the great addition to the responsibilities of Government, and the risk of attaching to it all the odium of evictions on non-payment of debt, just the same objection as applies to all systems of compulsory land purchase in Ireland. If this be deemed insuperable, then let the reduced debt be payable to the money-lenders at a rate of interest not exceeding six per cent. This may seem arbitrary, but it follows old Hindu precedents which allowed large discretion to the Punchayat (the village council of elders) to reduce usurious debts, and to do substantial justice between debtor and creditor. Even this would enormously aid the peasantry by reducing their legal charge for interest to nine millions a year instead of over twenty-five millions. Were the Government to take the whole case into their own hands according to my first suggestion, it would be necessary to guard against the recurrence of another pile of debts, for the Indian peasant has the readiness of a child to borrow without foreseeing consequences. It would be needful in this case to exempt his holding and agricultural implements, cattle, etc., from seizure for debt (except to the Government), on the principle of the "Homestead law" which exists in some of the States of America. When the usurer could get no security for his loans he would cease lending. It would greatly help this arrangement if a system of agricultural banks could be devised to make short advances in the time of scarcity before the harvest is reaped, when food often runs out. Perhaps these advances, made under Government supervision, at moderate interest and simply for the necessaries of life, might be allowed a first lien on the next harvest. The difficulty in India is that there is scarcely any spare capital to start industries and lift up the standard of living, and we need to have a succession of rulers like Lord Cromer in Egypt, who will make the economical welfare of the Indian people their main consideration, and shun the policy that makes for wars and troubles on the frontier. It has been said, "Happy is the nation that has no history." May it be so with our great Dependency this new century. May it be a time of steady upward progress without catastrophes or startling episodes.[1]

I make free to add a letter I wrote to Lord Curzon this year,

[1] For the latest information on the subject of Indian famines, see the excellent report by the Commission of which Sir Anthony McDonnell was the able chairman.

the publication of which I think he will not object to, as it deals solely with public questions :—

11, Delahay Street,
Westminster, S.W.
June 28, 1900.

My dear Lord Curzon,

It was very kind and considerate of you to write me at such length in your printed letter of June 5 in reply to my speech and the periodical I sent you, as also in your letter of May 2. I did not expect you would take so much trouble at a time when your labour and anxieties must be excessive. Indeed, I feel sorry at being the cause of so much trouble.

Let me explain that I did not refer to the sufferings from famine in the least to find fault with the Government, but to stir up sympathy in this country. Very little money was being raised for India at that time, as the nation was pre-occupied with the South African war; and the result of the debate was a large increase of the Mansion House Fund.

I am well aware that the Indian Government has made immense exertions to cope with the famine, and their officers have worked nobly as they always do when an emergency arises. Yet, in spite of all they can do, the sufferings are terrible, as your own letter to the *Times* shows, and the enclosed appeal of the Bishop of Calcutta, which was published in *The Times* this week.

I have seen many letters from missionaries of the same kind, and have spoken with people recently returned from the famine districts, who give awful accounts of the mortality. It seems from the investigation you made that the statement I quoted from Agra was far from accurate. I am sorry for this. I merely picked it out of a great mass of similar accounts which were lying before me. Of course it was impossible for me here to investigate each of them before quoting in the House, but I have no doubt they were substantially correct. They merely affirmed of various places what Bishop Weldon affirmed of the Bheels.

No doubt the sufferings are greatest in the native States, especially in Guzerat and Rajputana. I much fear that in some of them a considerable portion of the population has been swept away. One who knows India well, and who has been through several famines, tells me that 5 millions of people will die as the consequence of this famine. I enclose some papers and photos. just sent me by the *Times of India*.

[Here occurs a reference to some false charges of bad treatment of the Natives, which Lord Curzon had exposed. I go on to say :]

My own impression, drawn from two visits to India, is that our Civil servants, especially the higher ones, are most careful to treat the Natives with justice and courtesy. But I have seen the rougher class of Europeans acting rudely and insultingly. It always excited my indignation ; for there could not be a people more courteous, or more gentle and forbearing than the Hindoos, and any man with the feelings

of a gentleman should be touched by these qualities. A little kindness goes a long way with the Indian people. They almost worship a white man who treats them with consideration. I sometimes think that if we lose India it will be from some brutal acts of the coarser class of Europeans—such acts as drove the Tarquins out of Rome. But I am rejoiced to think that your powerful influence will do much to repress this tendency.

I may say in conclusion that it is very difficult to get at the truth in India. I twice travelled in that country to investigate certain questions, the first time in 1862–3, to see how far India could take the place of America to supply us with cotton during the American Civil War. I found that every fact stated by one authority was vehemently denied by another, and there seemed no common agreement on anything. Yet in course of time, by carefully comparing reports, and testing everything by personal examination, and by getting information *directly* from natives as well as Europeans, one came to certain conclusions which time has fully verified.

The conclusions which lie at the base of all sound government in India are (1) the extreme poverty of the people ; (2) the need of an economical government which taxes necessaries of life as lightly as possible ; (3) a moderate and permanent land assessment, so that the cultivators are encouraged to improve their little holdings by security of tenure ; (4) something in the nature of usury laws, or discretion of the courts, to restrict the powers of money-lenders, who are the scourge of India ; (5) every possible extension of irrigation by wells, tanks and canals ; and (6) the observance as far as possible of old Indian customs, such as the village Punchayat, and non-interference with caste prejudices ; and (7) utilizing Native agency as much as possible in the government of the country, and so diminishing the heavy drain for pensions to England ; in other words, ruling India for the good of the Indian people, not as a preserve for England.

I feel reluctant to intrude on your valuable time, but the fulness of your letters encourages me to reply at some length ; and I know that I address one who has a high sense of duty, and who looks at Indian problems with a fresh and independent mind.

Believe me,
Yours faithfully,
SAMUEL SMITH.

I was very successful with the ballot after Easter, and succeeded in securing three good places for successive Tuesdays (which was then the private members' day up till Whitsuntide). The first of these was for a motion on theatrical plays and their supervision, couched in the following terms :—

That this House regrets the growing tendency to put upon the stage plays of a demoralizing character, and considers that a stricter supervision of theatrical performances is needed alike in the interests of the public and the theatrical profession.

I had felt deeply for a long time that the growing degradation of the theatre was one of the greatest evils of the day, and was steadily undermining British morality. I had corresponded with the Lord Chamberlain, whose duty it is to license plays on the recommendation of the examiner, but could get no satisfaction. I was convinced that unless public opinion could be powerfully moved through Parliament, nothing would be done. I have found in this class of moral questions that where officials have to draw the line between what is permissible and what is not, the tendency is continually towards greater laxity. It comes in this way. The persons who have huge pecuniary interests in degrading amusements bring a constant pressure to bear on the officials, and contrive by ridicule, especially in the low comic papers, to pillory them if they show any zeal for morality. The public, on the other hand, are ignorant and apathetic, and have no rallying-point to focus their energies in favour of reform. A handful of bad men with a strong pecuniary interest in corrupting the public can make greater noise than a thousand times as many who are absorbed in their own occupations. Any one who begins to agitate against a corrupt system becomes a marked man, and is liable to abuse and misrepresentation, and few men will willingly subject themselves to this mud-throwing. I felt nothing would be done on this question or on the still more urgent one of the infamous condition of the London streets, without a public exposure of the evils in Parliament. I had laboured for many years through committees and otherwise at the latter question, with little effect, and was very desirous to strike a blow which would have a lasting result before strength failed me.

My first attempts seemed doomed to failure. On all the three days I had secured, the Government interfered so as to deprive me of the day. On the first of these occasions it put down an important Bill which would have effectually blocked my motion on the theatre ; but owing to an unusual waste of time over private bills and "questions" on that afternoon, Mr. Balfour suddenly withdrew his Bill, and left the House free to private members' motions, and I came on in a large House at 10 p.m., and got an excellent opportunity of delivering my speech, which, in spite of a few unseemly interruptions, commanded the full sympathy of the House.

I felt it was a very delicate subject. I do not remember that it was ever discussed before. I subjoin most of my speech, with

the reply of the Home Secretary, as it is very important to keep the matter alive. I am in hopes that some change for the better has ensued. I had letters from leading theatrical personages—some for, others against. One thing that struck me was their timidity to say or do anything that seemed to reflect on their profession. Yet my speech and the debate generally were well reported in the principal theatrical papers, and no doubt were read by the great bulk of the members of the profession; and one may hope that many in their hearts felt that the statements were too true. I said :—

I am well aware that I am attempting a difficult task in bringing the question of theatrical performances before the House ; yet I believe that few subjects attract greater attention at the present time, and that a great body of opinion, both inside and outside this House, is in sympathy with the resolution which I now submit to the House, viz :—

" That this House regrets the growing tendency to put upon the stage plays of a demoralizing character, and considers that a stricter supervision of theatrical performances is needed alike in the interests of the public and the theatrical profession."

Some of the first theatrical critics have been deploring for years past the decadent character of the drama, and in the opinion of some it has reached a lower stage than at any time since the Restoration. While in many departments of national life great progress has been registered during the Victorian era, it will not be denied that a class of plays is now acted which would have been prohibited fifty years ago as grossly immoral.

I am sure that the House will agree with me that this is no light matter. The moral standard of a country is largely affected by the drama. Multitudes of young men and young women form their ideas of what is right and wrong in no small degree from what they witness on the stage ; and when they see the purest and holiest things of life turned into derision and disgusting licentiousness treated as the normal rule of life, is it likely that their own moral standard will remain high ? Is it not certain that the same effects will follow in London as in Paris—that a decadent drama, and, what always accompanies it, a decadent literature, will produce a decadent nation ?

Now I shall rightly be asked for proof of these statements, and I shall confine myself almost entirely to competent critics, so that no one may ride off on the plea that I am bringing merely puritanical objections against the Stage. I freely acknowledge that the drama holds a great field in human education. The Attic Stage was a great educator of an illustrious people, and the best plays of Shakespeare fathom the depths of the human soul. What I wish to bring before the House is not the legitimate drama, but foul and corrupting plays that no good actor or actress should touch with a pitchfork, and which no youth can witness without taint.

By permission of Mr. Clement Scott, one of the oldest and best theatrical critics, I quote from a recent utterance of his in New York. Speaking of these degrading plays, he said :—

"Why should we not frankly call them heathen plays or plays destitute of any moral sense ; plays artfully contrived to attract sympathy for vice ; plays that cover detestable selfishness with a glamour of romance and sickly sentiment ; plays that bring the power and allurement of good acting, or show, or spectacle, or personal charm, to deaden our moral force and moral fibre ? That is where the danger lies."

Again he says :—

"We may ascribe it to the change of tone and thought at our public schools and Universities, to our Godless method of education, to the comparative failure of religion as an influence, to this, that, or the other. But there it is. We cannot get away from it. Society has accepted the satire, and our dramatists of the first class have one after the other broken away from the beautiful, the helpful and the ideal, and coquetted with the distorted, the tainted and the poisonous in life. Any appeal to them in the name of Art is vain. According to their utilitarian creed all must be good that pays, and so for the moment our theatres are crowded to excess to see 'snap-shot society dramas,' with their pronounced vulgarity, their hideous presentments of men and women, and their cheap satire."

I believe that the majority of this House, and the majority of the nation, know that these words are true, and many of our best actors and actresses wish it were not so. But they cannot or dare not speak out, for to do so is to be boycotted by the profession. There is a false code of honour in all professions, which makes the honourable members hesitate to denounce the dishonourable. But I am certain the sympathy of many of them is with those who work to reform the stage.

But I shall be asked to give specific proof. I will comply. The most popular and by far the ablest of these corrupting plays is *The Gay Lord Quex*, by Mr. A. W. Pinero. I leave the House to judge of this from the description given by the *Daily Telegraph*, one of the chief admirers of Mr. Pinero. It said at the first appearance of the play :—

"Seldom has an act so bold in conception, so daring in execution, been presented as that which follows. That Mrs. Grundy will raise her voice against it may be expected ; that the world of fashion will flock to see it is no less certain. In *The Princess and the Butterfly* Mr. Pinero broke in upon the sanctity of a lady's afternoon toilet. In *The Gay Lord Quex* he goes a step further and introduces us to the duchess's boudoir, with bedroom attached, on the stroke of midnight. Here the farewell meeting between her and Quex is to take place. On a little table stand a box of Argyropulos cigarettes, a bottle of champagne, 'Felix Poubelle, Carte d'Or,' and a couple of glasses. It is hardly to be denied that in several passages of this brilliant and extraordinarily ingenious act the very brink of unnecessary riskiness is reached. Words and phrases fall from the mouths of the artists which make the listener catch his breath and move uneasily in his place."

The *Westminster Gazette* said :—

"A little while ago Mr. John Hare was championing bravely the cause of propriety on the English stage, and denouncing indignantly the wickedness of Ibsen, and yet in *The Gay Lord Quex* he presents a piece with a wealth of indelicate detail as great in quantity as could be collected from all the Ibsen plays offered to the British public. What becomes of poor Nora's remarks about her stockings when compared with the scene where the beautiful duchess in her dressing-gown at midnight wonders with Lord Quex, who is with her in her bedroom, at what moment in their guilty intrigue he acquired from her the blue silk garter with diamond buckle which she exhibits to the audience ?"

I am told that fine ladies who were horrified at the first night of this play can now see nothing indelicate in it, and take their young daughters to initiate them into fast life. I can only say that if wealth and rank admire such scenes, they are below the breeding of the average costermonger.

I note that the author of this play made a speech at Birmingham a fortnight ago, in which he ridiculed the Lord Chancellor and Sir Edward Clarke for having courageously attacked these corrupting plays. The Lord Chancellor used these words :—

"On all sides intellectual development was visible, yet there were dark features in respect to our literary taste. Familiar public amusements, plays, and so on, were tainted with what, with all reverence, he might call the spirit of those who made a mock of sin. And to his mind it had become a serious question whether, seeing some of the plays now being enacted, there was any great advantage in finding somebody to act as censor, and to prevent them from being played. If some of the plays now before the public might be played he did not know what might not be played."

The majority of this House will, I believe, agree with the Lord Chancellor, and, I may add, with Sir Edward Clarke, who spoke to the same effect, and not with Mr. Pinero, who accused them of a prudish view of life and being unable to understand.

"that the real decadent drama and the real decadent literature were the drama and the literature which presented a flattering but false conception of human conduct."

And (concluded Mr. Pinero)

"they must not accuse us of discourtesy if we make bold to warn them of the danger of evil association with those people who, under the pretence of being moralists, are nothing but moral-mongers."

The *Era*—a leading theatrical paper—says of *Zaza* :—

"Playgoers who really love the dramatic profession will indeed feel sad after witnessing the first act of *Zaza*, now being performed at the Garrick Theatre. We have never seen the profession dragged through the mud so shamelessly. It is a great grief to us to find American actors and actresses taking part in such a disgraceful libel of their own calling and trying to bring their class into contempt, giving enemies of the drama an opportunity of pointing to evidence of the stage itself as to its inner life. It must be a bad bird that fouls its own nest."

I will give but one more criticism, from the pen of Mr. William Archer (*Morning Leader*, April 9, 1900) :—

"Take such a piece as *The Belle of New York*, for example—probably the greatest success of recent years. What was it but one long glorification of the vulgarest order of debauchery? In so far as it meant anything at all, it meant approval and admiration for drunkenness and all the other diversions of a recklessly 'fast' life. But was it the vicious or even the congenitally, fundamentally vulgar section of society that kept it running to full houses for eighteen months? Not at all! This section of course contributed its full quota to the devotees of the 'Belle'; but she also attracted in their thousands people of education and breeding, of decent life and presentable manners. Some of them fully realized the clotted vulgarity of the entertainment and revelled in the sense of superiority involved in that very realization.

"Vulgar entertainments there will always be so long as there are people of vulgar tastes to be catered for. But their popularity, in England, at any rate, would be much less overwhelming if people of culture and refinement did not affect and even parade, in regard to the theatre, a vulgarity of taste which they would blush to own in regard to any other department of art or of life. Many Oxford and Cambridge men, for example—not merely irresponsible undergraduates, but dons and dignitaries—when they run up to town for a few days, rush eagerly to *The Gaiety Girl* or *The Circus Girl*, or *The Belle of New York*, and can scarcely be dragged to any higher form of entertainment."

I must apologize to the House for dragging it through these sickening details. My object is to show what a farce the present form of censorship is. The Lord Chamberlain is the Earl of Hopetoun, and his deputy is Sir Spencer Ponsonby-Fane, and he has an examiner of plays, Mr. Redford, and on his advice the Lord Chamberlain gives this licence. These odious plays are now exempt from the common law of the country, which would put them down as indecent but for this licence. And now they go from London, all through the provinces, tainting the atmosphere wherever they go. All the higher and nobler attributes of human nature wither and perish in such an atmosphere. But the public is helpless, and weak-minded people say it must be all right because the censor has allowed it.

Is it any wonder that the Lord Chancellor asks for the abolition of the censorship? I am sure we should be far better off without it. Anyhow, it is an archaic survival of a time when only two patent theatres existed in London, and when the plays were performed by His Majesty's actors, and a Court official superintended them. It was altogether a Court affair. Now there is free trade in theatres, and a far more dangerous trade than that of publichouses is without any control at all.

I am a strong believer in local government. Wherever municipal bodies have powers, they use them for the good of the community. The music-halls in London were once as bad as, or worse than, the theatres; since they were placed under the County Council they have wonderfully improved. Every one tells me the change is astoni

The same would happen if the theatres of London were placed under the County Council. Public opinion would steadily act on the theatrical profession through this body. There would be kicking and restiveness for a time ; but at last the theatres would fall into line, and, after some of the worst had been refused their licences, the others would find it necessary to consult the moral sense of the community.

There has been a marvellous change effected in the city of Liverpool in my lifetime, through the action of the police directed against certain moral evils by a reforming Watch Committee and an intelligent bench of magistrates. The one department which remains hopelessly bad is the theatre, because it is not supposed to be subject to local control except as regards structural arrangements and the sale of refreshments. I feel sure that if the licensing of plays were given either to the municipality or the bench of magistrates the improvement that would take place would astonish every one.

I do not believe in the judgment of experts ; but I do believe in the average common-sense and the average morality of the ordinary householder. I have always found that his instincts are sounder than those of London society, which is invariably on the wrong side whenever there is a battle between good and evil.

In conclusion, I will say that I advocate this change in the interests of the theatrical profession itself. It is cruel to put modest women to play the part of harlots. It is very difficult to see how a woman can keep any refinement of soul when playing such disgraceful parts. What did Clement Scott say a year or two ago in *Great Thoughts* ?

" It is nearly impossible for a woman to remain pure who adopts the stage as a profession. Everything is against her. The freedom of life, of speech, of gesture, which is the rule behind the curtain, renders it almost impossible for a woman to preserve that simplicity of manner which is after all her greatest charm. The whole life is artificial and unnatural to the last degree, and, therefore, an unhealthy life to live. But there are far more serious evils to be encountered than these. These drawbacks are the things that render it impossible for a lady to remain a lady. But what is infinitely more to be deplored is that a woman who endeavours to keep her purity is almost of necessity foredoomed to failure in her career. It is an awful thing to say and it is still more terrible that it is true, but no one who knows the life of the green room will dare deny it.

" Nor do I see how a woman is to escape contamination in one form or another. Temptation surrounds her in every shape and on every side ; her prospects frequently depend upon the nature and extent of her compliance, and, after all, human nature is very weak."

I am glad to know that later on, in the same interview, he added :—

" Two things I want to be made clear :—

" (1) That it is quite possible to lead a good life on the stage. Thousands do. Miss ——— for instance is as good a woman as ever lived. But the fact that many do lead good lives does not remove the great temptations from the weaker brethren."

I need say no more on this painful topic. The better part of the

theatrical profession will be most thankful if some check can be put on the frightful temptations that surround the stage.

One reason for the failure of the censorship must be obvious to every one. The written words of a play do not really show its moral tendency. That depends on dress, gestures, and suggestive acting. It is for this reason that I believe no real control can be exercised over theatres, except by the power of refusing licences on the ground that the management has been on the whole bad and depraving. I have found by a long experience in Liverpool that this principle applied by an intelligent bench of magistrates to the licensing of publichouses has effected an astonishing revolution in the order and decency of those places. The same would hold good of theatres. A few examples made of notorious offenders would lift up the whole moral level of the stage.

Let me add that there are many related evils which we cannot grapple with so long as extreme licence is allowed to the stage. One of the worst of these is that of depraving pictures, drawn from the most indecent exhibitions in theatres, which are sold to youths. The worst scenes are photographed and collected into books and sold to boys, or published in the low illustrated paper, which is one of the deadliest evils of the day. You cannot prosecute these obscene pictures with any chance of success while you tolerate their presentation in theatres.

It cannot be denied that the glorification of harlotry, which is thought by some to be a sign of high art, is undermining that wholesome repugnance to vice which used to be a mark of English society. Only on that ground can I explain the following quotation from Mr. Lecky's *Map of Life* :—

"A more recognized though probably not really more pernicious example of false ideals is to be found in the glorification of the *demi-monde*, which is so conspicuous in some societies and literatures. In a healthy state of opinion, the public, ostentatious appearance of such persons, without any concealment of their character, in the great concourse of fashion, and among the notabilities of the State, would appear an intolerable scandal, and it becomes much worse when they give the tone of fashion and become the centres and models of large and by no means undistinguished sections of society. The evils springing from this public glorification of the class are immeasurably greater than the evils arising from its existence. The standard of popular morals is debased. Temptation in its most seductive form is forced upon inflammable natures, and the most pernicious of all lessons is taught to poor, honest, hard-working women."

The sensuous and indelicate modes of dressing, so common in London society, and which scandalize our American and Colonial friends, are also an outcome of the low morals of the theatre. The people who gloat over *Lord Quex* and *Zaza* have already reached a level where mere accident alone keeps them from leading such lives themselves.

I cannot too strongly express my conviction that a decadent drama and a decadent literature mark a stage in national decline. All the

great empires of antiquity perished of internal corruption. "The mills of God grind slowly, but they grind exceeding small." The congestion of idle, dissolute wealth we have in London is the great danger in this country. Let me appeal to the strong spirit of Imperialism that now exists, and which has led to noble self-sacrifice. Would it not be the highest patriotism to keep the heart of this great Empire sound? Is it not lamentable to find that our Colonial and Indian fellow-subjects, when they visit the Metropolis of the Empire, are often staggered at the orgies of vice they witness? If we wish to maintain the loyalty of this great Empire we must keep a standard at home which will command its respect.

Is not this a favourable moment to attempt moral reforms? Many families are in mourning. London society has lost its usual gaiety. Many are saying, "Oh, for the touch of a vanished hand, and the sound of a voice that is still!" Is this not the voice of God calling the nation to repentance? Let this House strike a true keynote to-night, and it will awake a response it little dreams of.

Reply of the Home Secretary

The *Times*, May 16, 1900

The Right Hon. Sir M. W. Ridley, Bart., said there were one or two points to which he should like to call the attention of the House. As the House knew, there was no censorship or check of the drama in the hands of any Government department, and he hoped the day might be long distant when there would be an attempt on the part of the Government to do anything of the kind. At the same time there was a censorship of plays and a licensing of theatres in the hands of the Lord Chamberlain. He had had some conversation with the Lord Chamberlain upon this subject, and he thought his feeling was that a debate on the subject and an expression of opinion by that House that there were certain things that might be checked with advantage would strengthen his hands. At the same time he was not prepared to admit the words of the resolution. He did not think the House was in a position to state that there was a growing tendency to put a lower class of plays on the stage; and to pass a resolution stating that a stricter supervision was necessary was, he thought, to cast a reflection on the exercise of his duties by the Lord Chamberlain. He did not think that any mention had been made in the course of the debate of the appointment in 1891 of a Committee, which reported in 1892 on this very subject. The Committee went exhaustively into the subject, and they came to the conclusion that there was no sufficient reason why the jurisdiction of the Lord Chamberlain, which had been so long exercised, without favour or miscarriage, to the advantage of the public and all interested, should now be transferred. That being so, he thought the House should not without further consideration pass a resolution to the contrary, if, indeed, that were the meaning of the hon. gentleman opposite. *The hon. gentleman had said there was no control over theatres, but in the pro-*

vinces that control was absolute,[1] and he had not heard that there was any complaint of the way in which the theatres in the provinces were conducted. As regarded theatres in London, it was within the province of the Lord Chamberlain not only to censor plays before they were acted, but also to refuse a licence to a theatre if a play was not conducted satisfactorily; and it was within his own knowledge that within very recent times warnings had been given to theatre managers that, if certain things were not altered, the licence would be withdrawn. It was perfectly true that censorship of a play before it was acted could not be a sufficient check, but he ventured to think that there was no evidence that the licensing of theatres within the jurisdiction of the Lord Chamberlain was any worse than that within the jurisdiction of the County Council. Within the metropolis forty theatres or so were licensed by the Lord Chamberlain and certain others by the County Council, and if hon. members would look at the names of those theatres and see whether they had in their opinion transgressed he thought they would find that objections might be applied at least as much to the theatres licensed by the County Council as to those licensed by the Lord Chamberlain. He did not wish to argue the question, but he would remind the House that very recently they passed a resolution which affirmed that, while supervision was desirable by way of censorship and licensing, yet it was not desirable that there should be any transference of the duties from the office of the Lord Chamberlain. He thought that any expression of opinion by the House would strengthen the hands of the Lord Chamberlain, who, he knew, desired to do his best in difficult circumstances; but the House would remember it was a very difficult thing to settle what was the kind of play which ought or ought not to be permitted and that a play which in itself was inoffensive might be made most offensive by the manner in which it was presented, while there were many plays which were offensive in themselves and which if presented on the stage by clever actors and actresses might by the exercise of art and by exhibition of good acting be rendered inoffensive. He was sure that they must all admire the earnestness of the hon. gentleman the member for Flintshire, but he could not help thinking that the hon. gentleman had been guilty of some exaggeration. They would all admit that the hon. gentleman was desirous of doing good in the direction he had indicated, and he trusted that he might do so. He could not, however, assent to the resolution, but he heartily hoped it might do some good in purifying the stage.

APPENDIX

The Licensing of Theatres

The material part of Section 7 of the Local Government Act of 1888 runs as follows:—

"There shall be transferred to the County Council, on and after the appointed day, the business of the Justices of the County out of session—

[1] Italics are mine.—S. S.

"(A). In respect of the licensing of houses or places for the public performance of stage plays."

The powers of the Justices thus transferred to local bodies are regulated by "The Theatres Act," 1843 (6 and 7 Vic. cap. 68). By section 2 of this Act, every house kept for the performance of stage plays must be licensed, either by the Lord Chamberlain (whose jurisdiction, by Section 3, extends to the Parliamentary Boroughs of the Cities of London and Westminster, the Boroughs of Marylebone, Finsbury, the Tower Hamlets, Lambeth, and Southwark, and the Boroughs where His Majesty occasionally resides); or, outside such jurisdiction, by the Justices of the Peace (Section 5). By Section 9 the Justices had power to make rules for enforcing order in the theatres licensed by them, which rules may be altered by a Secretary of State.

Extract from the *Daily Mail*, May 17, 1900

The Censor's Retort

"There is not a play in London to-day of a degrading tendency."

So said Mr. George Redford, Examiner of Plays, to a *Daily Mail* reporter, who found him at Brighton yesterday. He had not seen the report of the debate in the House of Commons, and perused it with much interest.

"It is a strange thing that I should have heard nothing of this," he said. "I admit that I do not look at my work from the point of view of Mr. Samuel Smith. I am not in any sense a censor of morals. My work is to read and to report to the Lord Chamberlain whether plays submitted should be licensed or not. It is not my business to find excuses for refusing plays, but to pass every one that can possibly be passed.

"To me," continued the Examiner, "it seems a very serious matter to refuse a play. Each one involves considerable financial interest. The employment of many people depends upon it, and an arbitrary objection would lead to much loss, but where necessary I do not hesitate. I have rejected three or four pieces this year alone.

"But if I were to judge, as Mr. Smith would have me do, the whole country would rise against my office.

"Three plays may be considered more or less risky, and they are *The Gay Lord Quex*, *Nurse*, and *Zaza*. First comes *The Gay Lord Quex*. Are not the denunciations of it answered by the course of the play itself? It was written by the greatest of living dramatists, Mr. Pinero, produced by the most famous of comedians, Mr. Hare, and it scored the greatest success of the year.

"That *Nurse* would in any degree demoralize any person who witnessed it I fail to see. In *Zaza* the main objection is confined to the first act. I did not see a line of the play to which I could legitimately object. Its success shows that I was justified in passing it."

Extracted from the *Times*, May 22, 1900.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
Monday, May 21.

The Examiner of Plays

Mr. S. Smith (Flintshire) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he was aware that the principle acted upon by the Examiner of Plays in the execution of his duties is that he is in no way a censor of morals, but that his duty is solely to read all plays submitted, and, in reporting to the Lord Chamberlain whether such plays should be licensed or not, to advise that every play which can possibly be approved shall be passed ; and whether, if this was a correct definition of the present duties of the Examiner of Plays, he would consider the advisability of establishing a stricter supervision.

Sir M. W. Ridley (Lancashire, Blackpool) : No, Sir. The terms of the question do not correctly define the present duties of the Examiner of Plays. Those duties were accurately defined by Mr. Pigott, the former Examiner of Plays, before a Select Committee of the House of Commons in 1892, and were considered satisfactory by that Committee. The present Examiner has instructions to follow the rules then approved.

Mr. S. Smith asked if the right hon. gentleman was aware that the question was drawn from a statement of the present Examiner of Plays.

Sir M. W. Ridley : It may be that the Examiner made indiscreet remarks in the course of an interview of an unexpected character, but I have asked the Lord Chamberlain and am informed that the instructions are in strict accordance with those set before the House of Commons Committee of 1892 and approved by them.

Mr. Gibson Bowles asked would the Examiner be rebuked for his indiscreet remarks.

Sir M. W. Ridley : I believe he has already incurred that penalty.

My next motion about the disgraceful condition of the streets of London stood for the following Tuesday, but the Government took that day. However, I afterwards secured a place for July 13 on the vote for the Home Office. My third motion, on Ritualistic teaching in Voluntary schools, stood first for the Tuesday before the Whitsuntide recess. It evidently troubled the Government very much. It was so drafted that the whole Church question could be discussed, and they were determined to stop, if possible, all debates on that burning question this session ; and so the plan was adopted—I can only call it a stratagem—to do what I never remember to have seen before, viz., to adjourn the House on Monday for the Whitsuntide recess. Mr. Balfour informed me that I could bring forward my motion on the Education vote as soon as the House met after the adjournment ; but I

ascertained from Mr. Lowther, the chairman of Committee, that I could not then discuss fully the points I meant to raise on my motion, as we are strictly limited in Committee of Supply to such matters as are concerned with the spending of public money. My appeal to the Leader of the House was rejected, and apparently I was ruled out of court; but I ascertained from an old Parliamentary strategist that by taking my motion off the paper I could rise when the motion for adjournment was put on Monday, and insist on speaking on the subject of my motion. I tried the experiment and found that the Speaker sanctioned it, and I delivered practically the same speech I had intended doing had the Government left me the Tuesday. I got an excellent opportunity and a good House, and was listened to attentively, for all knew how I had been treated.

My object was to show how the whole Church system of education was increasingly coming under the control of the Romanizing section, and was being used to stamp out the principles of the Reformation, more especially through their Training Colleges. I quoted from the books of history used in these colleges, and showed that they were filled with a strong bias against the Reformers of the Elizabethan age, and the Puritans of the seventeenth century. They were intended to instil into the minds of the teachers who were to educate three millions of the children of England a dislike and suspicion of such men as Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley, of Cromwell, Hampden and Milton, of Baxter, Bunyan and Howe, and the great Puritan divines, and to glorify such men as Charles I, Laud and Strafford. I showed how such a travesty of history was bound to separate us from our kindred across the Atlantic, and from the great mass of our own colonists who look up with reverence to those champions of liberty. The Pilgrim Fathers were the names most honoured in America, yet Wakeman, the most popular historian of the High Church Party, has no word of praise for them. He speaks as follows about the Reformers and their doctrines:—

> The vast majority of the English Protestant martyrs who suffered in the reign of Queen Mary were not people of religious influence, but were illiterate fanatics.

Again he says:—

> The Evangelical Churchmen interpreted the Prayer Book by the light of their own prepossessions; they cared little for its history and

tradition, ignored much of its teaching and ritual, and valued it chiefly for the devotional beauty of its language.

Again :—

Newman argued that there was no Catholic doctrine, and hardly any theological Roman doctrine condemned by these Articles, but only popular exaggerations and misrepresentations of Roman doctrines current at the time when the Articles were drawn up. Most men would now admit that for the purpose which he had in hand Newman's argument was, in the main, sound.

I also showed that several of the diocesan inspectors of religious education were members of the English Church Union and other Ritualistic societies, and that they were bound by their own principles to advocate the Confessional, Mariolatry, Purgatory, and the doctrine of the Mass, and I gave several instances which were not disproved where the children of the school were regularly marched to church to attend Mass on church holidays. A good debate followed, and I attained my end. I again raised the subject on the education vote the first day the House met after the recess, and gave many more instances of the abuse of the Voluntary schools to proselytize the children of Dissenters and to stamp out Protestant teaching; and I showed how entirely the teachers were at the mercy of a bigoted clergyman, giving instances from the address of Mr. Jackman, the President of the National Union of Teachers.

He mentions that a mistress was dismissed because she would not attend "Early Communion"; a master was dismissed because he attended evangelical services in the neighbouring village; another because he refused to chant the psalms; another because he refused to sit in the choir, and another because he managed the village library.

I also showed that in several places Protestant children were obliged to attend Roman Catholic schools. I quoted the case of Southport :—

At Southport the parents of 1,200 children applied for free places, and on November 19, 1896, the Department directed 300 of these children to find free places in St. Mary's Roman Catholic school and the Dean Cooke Roman Catholic Memorial school, and informed 300 more that they must wait until a new Church of England school was built in the Marshside district. Nearly all the children in question are of Protestant families, and most of them Nonconformists.

I also quoted the following, which I received from a London School Board teacher :—

> The Romish schools in London are swarming with Protestant children, who are being indoctrinated and trained at first hand by Romish teachers, not at second hand, as in the Church of England schools. How can this be proved ? By asking for a return of Protestant children who are attending Roman Catholic schools in the London School Board district. Once in these schools, we know what will happen. How, then, have these children got into Romish schools ? Not certainly by the wish of their parents, but against it. They are driven into these schools by the direct action of the employees and officials of the London School Board. This is the process. A poor workingman's child presents himself or herself for admission to a Board school. The signs of the parents' hard lot are visible on the child. Though clean, his or her clothes are not so good—they are most likely patched, and not cut in the latest fashion—as the poor hard-worked mother has been the tailor. The superior head teacher looks at the child, sees at a glance the class it belongs to, and does not consider it fit companion for the well-clad children of the clerks and tradesmen, whose children are getting a superior education for nothing at that school. So the superior head teacher shakes his or her head, and, under one pretence or other, illegally refuses to admit the child. The visitor then comes round and finds the child not in attendance. The mother reports the refusal. The visitor then, instead of reporting the refusal to headquarters, as he is bound to do, for his own ease, or to please the teacher, suggests the Romish school. The poor parents, harried by the School Board, are driven, for the sake of peace, to send the children to the last place they would otherwise wish them to go.

I may state that in reply to these complaints the stereotyped answer of the Vice-President, Sir John Gorst, was that the Board of Education had no right to interfere.

If I may leap over two years in time, I would add that the vehement opposition to the present Education Bill of the Government is mainly owing to this abuse of the system of Voluntary schools by the extreme Ritualistic clergy. Had the religious teaching remained what it used to be half a century ago, viz., scriptural training common to all Protestant and Evangelical bodies, there would not have been the determined opposition that there is. Speaking broadly, the whole laity of England, Church and Dissent alike, are content that young children should get a competent knowledge of the Bible; but when thinly-veiled Romanism is taught, it excites a feeling bordering on revolt, and unless it can be stopped I foresee the great danger of such a reaction as will sweep all religious teaching from the national schools, and leave

them purely secular, a result I would deeply deplore. The action of the priests has produced this result in France, and to a large extent in Italy and elsewhere, and so strong is the feeling in Spain, that if a Republic is established it would be as anti-clerical as in France. In all advanced nations there is a revolt, not against religion, but against clericalism, and it would be lamentable if in England also the substance should perish while we fight about the shadow.

The last subject I was impelled to bring before the House was a very painful one, viz., the sad condition of the streets of London at night, and I got my opportunity on July 13 on the vote for the Home Office. I never had to undertake so trying a duty. From the time I gave public notice of this question, information of the most distressing kind poured in upon me, some of it of a kind that I could not use publicly, it was so shocking. I was made to feel that unless a moral reform took place our Metropolis would go down like the great cities of antiquity, destroyed by its own vices. I refer not only to the open and shameless exhibition of vice in the streets and low theatres, but to the vile papers, pictures and mutoscopic exhibitions which corrupted the young wholesale. Nothing has brought more evil than the indecent pictures shown by the mutoscope in London and seaside places of amusement. I had been trying for years to stop these by correspondence with officials, without much effect. Nothing but an exposure in Parliament would effect real reform. The police in many places received no encouragement from the magistrates to interfere. They were as likely as not to be rebuked for officiousness; and a class of illustrated paper was allowed in London which was only fit for Sodom and Gomorrah.

I got great aid from the National Vigilance Society and its admirable secretary, Mr. Coote, who has been a public benefactor to London and to Britain for many years, and who is now drawing together all right-thinking people over Europe to form leagues to stop these abominations. The congresses held at various Continental cities, and notably at Paris last July, have done wonders in stopping incitements to vice and in protecting the young of both sexes. But London had been going back while they were going forward. While the northern cities of Britain had wonderfully improved, the metropolis, for reasons which I gave in my speech, had become a scandal and a disgrace to the Empire.

I had an excellent hearing in a full House, and was ably seconded

by Mr. Souttar, and supported by John Burns with some very practical suggestions, and was sympathetically replied to by the Home Secretary. The subject is not of a kind which I would inflict on ordinary readers, but it is of great importance that the facts and the state of the law should be known to social reformers, and therefore I quote my speech and a brief report of the debate that followed in the Appendix (XVI.).

I have since learned that great improvements have taken place in London. The police have been instructed to act with more decision in suppressing such things as vile mutoscopic exhibitions, obscene pictures and papers, and open exhibitions of vice in the streets. My friend, Mr. Caine, has again ably raised the question in the House this Session (1902), and he tells me that the abuse of the mutoscope is at an end in London. I hope this is equally true of other places, especially sea-side resorts. The new municipalities are vigorously addressing themselves to the condition of the streets. The Duke of Norfolk, with a deputation of the Westminster City Council, approached the Home Secretary on this subject. Before the election of these new municipal councils the Vigilance Society distributed 50,000 copies of the debate to the electors of London, and a large number of councillors were returned pledged to put an end to this shocking state of things. I may say that 100,000 of each of my speeches on the theatre and streets were circulated through the country by the Vigilance Society and otherwise, to stir up magistrates and officials to use the powers they already possess. The difference is enormous between cities like Glasgow, which fully use these powers, and others, like London, which do not. Even in regard to the theatre, local bodies, except in London, have full discretion to give or withhold licences, just as is the case with public-houses; and if a firm policy were adopted to refuse licences where gross abuses prevailed, we would soon see a marked change for the better.

This speech on "the Streets" was the last I was able to make in Parliament, and practically closed my public work, though I had fair health in the autumn, and was able to fight the election of October, 1900, and was returned by a slightly increased majority—606. Yet before the next Parliament met I had a severe breakdown of the nervous system, and almost an entire failure of the digestive organs, which has been chronic till quite recently. I attended Parliament in the Session of 1901 up till Whitsuntide, when a complete collapse occurred, and I have not been able since

then to resume my public work. So I fittingly conclude the review of my "life work" with the Session of 1900, deeply grateful that I got so many opportunities for serving my generation, hoping and trusting that my mistakes will be forgiven, and that my efforts may bear fruit in the time to come.

* * * * *

A long residence in the South of France induced me to write the following letter to the *Times* in the spring of this year. It will seem to some to be outside the scope of my life work, which has always been on the line of peace and good-will; yet it appears to me that as the nation has adopted Imperialism as its policy, it must pay the price which alone can make it safe.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

To the Editor of the "Times"

SIR,—A compulsory residence in the south of France of some months for the sake of health has made me reflect seriously on the question of our national defences. No one can travel on the Continent nowadays without becoming painfully aware of the universality of the ill-will borne to England. It perhaps reaches its most acute form in Germany, but it is encountered everywhere. The South African War has immensely increased it, but it did not create it. Envy at our prosperity and vast Empire has much to do with it, our insular conceit and hauteur have augmented it, and the tactless speeches sometimes made by our statesmen do not tend to mollify it. I see no sign that it will pass away. Our colonies and possessions embrace all the temperate zone, and only by dispossessing us can rival nations found colonies suited to a European race. We can hardly doubt that one or more nations have this as their settled policy should any reasonable opportunity offer itself.

All the great nations of Europe now drill their whole able-bodied male population, and require them to serve in the regular army for two or three years after twenty. They then pass into the various stages of the reserves, but can be called out in emergencies till forty or above that age. France, Germany and Russia can each mobilize two or three millions of trained soldiers in a few weeks, with large reserves behind them. Indeed, the Channel alone separates us from ten or fifteen millions of possible hostile armies, and, but for our enormous and costly yet necessary fleet, it would soon be written "Britannia fuit."

Now the point that impresses me is this. Is it safe wholly to rely on our fleet? Nelson once followed the French fleet to the West Indies, which gave him the slip, and very nearly gave Napoleon possession of the Channel, when a week would have enabled him to r an immense army on our shores. Is there any certainty that

conjuncture of this kind may not happen again? Is it certain that the Great Powers of Europe will never again combine against us, or that France and Germany may never be able to bury the hatchet for the sake of dealing us a crushing blow? When our Regular Army was practically sent out of the country two years ago, and much of the Militia as well, our home defence rested almost entirely with the Volunteers—not embodied and but slightly trained at the best. Most of us felt at times grave anxiety. Who can tell but that serious attempts were then made to enlist a combination against us, as we have good reason to think was attempted against the United States during the Spanish war? Some future historian may unearth proposals akin to the late Emperor Napoleon's suggestion to Bismarck to dismember Belgium.

I am a man of peace. I hate war, and have striven against every war since I entered public life. I have sought to moderate our lust of empire, and preached conciliation with all nations, but I cannot shut my eyes to facts that are undoubted. We shall have in this Session of Parliament to grapple with the question of the national defences. I have come very slowly and reluctantly to the conclusion that a small measure of universal service in the Militia or Volunteer force for home defence is necessary. This is not "the conscription" as understood on the Continent. There it enforces barrack-life in the regular army for, usually, three years, to be followed by twenty years of liability for service. All that I should propose is that each able-bodied man at twenty years of age should elect to serve either in the Militia or Volunteers, and be liable for five years in case of emergency, to be called out solely for home defence. This would give, roughly, 200,000 recruits annually or a million between twenty and twenty-five years of age, which would be ample, and would probably never be called for. The existence of such a force would prevent dreams of invasion. In a very serious war, when the regular army was withdrawn, perhaps two years' recruits, or 400,000 men, might be temporarily embodied, but that would be enough.

Speaking broadly, the tax would be six months' service in the Militia the first year, and perhaps a fortnight each of the following four years, and in the Volunteer force some addition to the present very moderate requirements. The Government could then lay down a *minimum* requirement, which they cannot do now without the risk of breaking up the force. Young men at present must consult the wishes of their employers, or risk their situations, but if the entire youth at a certain age had to serve, employers would adapt themselves to it, and no prejudice would accrue to any one. In Germany employers adapt themselves to the far heavier tax and it does not interfere with their industries. They are our most formidable competitors, and the general opinion in Germany is that the physical exercise, and the drill and discipline, make the men better workmen and more reliable in after-life. Probably the Volunteers would have to go into camp one month for the first year, and a week or a fortnight each of the succeeding four years, and this would be sufficient, added to the customary drill in the even-

ings and Saturday afternoons as at present. But the men would live at home and follow their usual pursuits as they do now, saving for the short period of camp life.

By a process of natural selection the rougher classes would gravitate to the Militia, in which, pay would be higher and connexion closer with the Regular Army. The industrial and professional classes who aim at civil life would enter the Volunteer force as they do now, but in greatly increased numbers. An enormous advantage to a nation like ours would be the physical exercise in the open air. The great bulk of our population now lives in towns, often in unhealthy surroundings, especially in the manufacturing towns. I fear the physique is steadily deteriorating with a large section of the community. It is not equal to that of the Germans. This process would supply a splendid system of national gymnastics. Vast numbers of our youths waste their evenings in effeminate amusements, accompanied with betting and drinking and excessive smoking. Such a system as I advocate would give a healthy reaction towards a manlier life. Great nations have frequently perished of luxury and vice—none of hardship and self-denial. This is a pleasure-loving, luxurious age, and this unfortunate war would be a blessing in disguise if it enforced on the whole nation a more serious view of life. And if rightly managed this moderate requirement for home defence might be made a means of moral improvement at the most plastic time of life. Our Commander-in-Chief, Lord Roberts, has aided all temperance and religious work in the Army, and would do so with the allied services. The nation would judge of the system very much by its moral effect. If it was found to deteriorate the men it would not stand, but if it improved them it would become a permanent institution.

I am convinced that there is patriotism enough in the nation to respond to this demand. It would add to the respect in which we are held, and would show that we regard our Empire as worth upholding; it is worth upholding the *pax Britannica* which enables 400 millions of human beings to enjoy law and liberty combined as never before in human history, which opens to one-fourth of the human race the priceless boon of religious liberty and the free preaching of the good news of Christianity.

Another motive that weighs with me is the desire to limit our Regular Army to the smallest dimensions necessary. Barrack-life for several years is not good for a young man. Vicious habits too often grow up to be a source of life-long evil.

The more you can defend a country by a citizen soldiery the better, but we cannot dispense with a small Regular Army recruited by voluntary enlistment. We cannot take by compulsion men to serve all over the world. No country would stand it. All we can do is to provide for home defence by an adequate force, and leave the Regulars for foreign service in the main. But it is evident that if we pass the bulk of the population through a short period of training, and a great emergency arose, Volunteers would be obtained to a far larger extent to supplement the Regular Army. After ten years we would have

two millions of fairly-trained men, and from that great reservoir the Government, by offering sufficient inducements, would get any reinforcements needed by the Regular Army, with large additions from the colonies.

This conclusion I have been driven to, in spite of much bias against it. I have never spoken or written in favour of armaments. My work in Parliament and out of it has lain in other directions. Now in weakened health, it seems doubtful if, this session, I shall raise my voice in Parliament, but I feel led to give through your columns what I do feel to be a needed counsel. Perhaps my well-known love of peace may give weight to my words with some who are little moved by "service members" or jingo appeals.

I am yours, etc.,
SAMUEL SMITH.

Mentone, February 13.

Let me add a word on the subject of foreign policy. I do not believe any State alliance is possible with European powers. Their policy and aims are incompatible with ours. They regard this vast Empire with ill-concealed jealousy, and would hamper our trade wherever they have power.

It is different with the United States. There is a true community of life and thought between the English-speaking nations. One soon feels as much at home in America as in Britain, though it is true that diverse and incongruous elements have passed into that country, some of them very hostile to us. Yet the dominant power remains and will remain with the Anglo-Saxon race, and it gradually assimilates those other elements and transmutes them into good Americans. A far better understanding now exists between our respective nations, and all statesmen worthy of the name should work for a common understanding and a common policy. A noble ideal, even if unattainable, elevates a nation. I would add as the true ideal of both British and American statesmanship, the unification or confederation of the whole English-speaking race. The United States is rapidly filling up. Its stores of virgin territory are nearly exhausted. We possess in our colonies, especially Canada, unlimited resources of virgin territory. Some day the stream of emigration will set in to these territories. Canada alone could feed and maintain 100 millions of people. If friction with the United States could be avoided, and ultimately some amalgamation carried out embracing the whole Empire, we would present a front to the world that would be unassailable and make for universal peace. Such a confederation need not

touch our domestic institutions. A monarchy and a republic might be united, just as our self-governing colonies, which are virtually republics, work in harmony with our old aristocratic institutions. This may be a dream. Certainly I will not live to see it; but it may become an article of faith to the coming generation as it was to the late Cecil Rhodes, who did much to bring it to pass.

* * * * *

My last words will be on the still deeper subject of National Religion. It is the true basis of national life. As the German Emperor said recently, "A nation without religion is a lost nation"; and I venture to conclude this work with a brochure I published last year in the form of an address to the Christian Endeavour Societies of Liverpool. I would add that the tone is perhaps a little too pessimistic. I have recently been struck with the chastened tone of our newspaper press and public men. The war, the endless anxieties of the last few years, among which I may class the awful massacres in China and the narrow escape of the legations at Pekin, the Indian famines, the illness of our King, his delayed Coronation, now happily accomplished—all these events have subdued pride and boasting to a wonderful degree, and the hand of God is now recognized as would not have been the case a few years ago. I would therefore somewhat qualify the address that follows by expressing the hope and prayer that a time of uplifting and uprising is before the nation, and that great evils will be dealt with more earnestly and searchingly than ever before. I venture to add to the Appendix an excursus on the spread of Rationalism, the absurdities of which I have dealt with as Pascal dealt with the monstrous doctrines of the Jesuits of his day. The weapon of irony is lawful, being sanctioned by St. Paul himself, and my "parody" may, I hope, open the eyes of some to the precipice they are approaching.

I think it may interest this Convention of Christian Endeavour Societies if I take as the subject of my Presidential Address "National Religion." A somewhat long public life has familiarized me with the ebbs and flows of public feeling on moral and religious questions. I have felt of late years that it is possible to teach Christianity too exclusively on an individual basis and that we hardly recognize how much the nation is a living organism, liable to periods of spiritual growth and decline. Certainly the greater part of the Old Testament is occupied with God's dealings with nations. The prophets are cl

with powerful denunciations of evil, and calls to national repentance, and Israel was finally cast off because of disobedience. The New Testament deals more directly with the individual soul: "Each one of us must give account of himself to God": "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" Yet the social environment is not neglected: the final aim of Christ's work is the kingdom of Righteousness. "And there were great voices in heaven saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ, and He shall reign for ever and ever."

The closing picture we have of God's Kingdom in the book of Revelation is the Holy City, New Jerusalem, "The kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it . . . and there shall not enter into it anything that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination nor maketh a lie, but they which are written in the Lamb's Book of Life."

This being so, it may be not unprofitable to take a glance at our own nation, and ask whither we are tending.

Nothing is more difficult than to measure national progress. The great complexity of modern life, its endless currents and counter-currents, its advancement in one direction, and retrogression in another; all tend to bewilder and confuse the observer. But there stand out certain broad features which he who runneth may read. I have felt since I entered Parliament that there has been a marked decline in what I may call the enthusiasm for national righteousness. In the earlier days of the Victorian epoch we had trumpet tongues that proclaimed the highest standards of duty; Gladstone and Bright never ceased to hold up ideals of national life formed and modelled on the teaching of our Saviour. They had the ear of the nation; indeed, I might say the ear of Christendom. All great moral evils both at home and abroad were unsparingly denounced. An incessant agitation went on for the abolition of all forms of slavery, of injurious and immoral trades like that of opium, and of all laws that favoured vicious indulgence: for the emancipation of oppressed races and nationalities: and for international peace and arbitration. Men like Garibaldi and Kossuth were our national heroes. England was looked to as the home of freedom by all oppressed races. Parliament was largely occupied with schemes of social reform, and it accurately reflected the earnest tone of the community.

A great change for the worse has, in my judgment, taken place during the last twenty years. The moral sense of the nation has been weakened; wealth and luxury have immensely increased, and with them have come in lower standards of life and duty. Imperialism has taken the place of Responsibility. The prophets who struck the keynote of righteousness have passed away. They have left no successors, at least none of commanding genius, to rouse the nation. They have been succeeded by mere politicians and opportunists. An air of cynicism has replaced the earlier enthusiasm, and the tone of fashionable society is, above all things, "not too much zeal." Exactly the same feature has characterized the literature of the day. The lofty strains

of Wordsworth and Tennyson have not found successors in England, nor those of Longfellow or Whittier in America, for exactly the same process has been going on in the other Anglo-Saxon nation. Materialism has been the dominant note, idealism has been scouted, and under the name of realism a class of books have come into existence which are little better than garbage, and which were scarcely known in England in the early Victorian period. The Drama has felt the change in its most deadly form, and the public tolerates, and even applauds, debasing pictures of life. As Clement Scott says :—

"Our dramatists of the first class have one after the other broken away from the beautiful, the helpful, and the ideal, and coquetted with the distorted, the tainted and the poisonous in life. Any appeal to them in the name of Art is vain. According to their utilitarian creed all must be good that pays, and so for the moment our theatres are crowded to excess to see 'snap-shot society dramas,' with their pronounced vulgarity, their hideous presentments of men and women, and their cheap satire."

This was the state of affairs in England when we drifted into the South African War. The nation was surfeited by prosperity, and blinded to the real facts of the situation, and the disasters and heavy losses that followed came like lightning from a blue sky. I saw much the same condition of things when I visited the United States in 1860. I found excessive pride in material success, intense self-confidence and contempt for sober counsels. The thunder-clouds were heavily charged, and the tempest broke next year ; and for four weary years the great Republic was deluged with blood and almost rent in pieces. I again visited it after the war was over, and found a wonderful change in the public mind. A chastened feeling had replaced the boastful tone. The best men had come to the front. A deep religious movement had passed over the land, and one felt that these words had a national as well as an individual application : "Whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth."

Before asking whether we may expect similar fruits from our national troubles, I wish to turn for a moment to the religious state of our country during the last two or three decades. After all, the roots of a nation's well-being lie deep in private and personal religion. The outward exhibition of righteousness can only be based on a foundation of pious God-fearing lives, and when that disappears or is fatally impaired, the outer fabric topples down.

I note two great changes that have passed over the religious world of England in the second half of the nineteenth century : the first a constructive movement, the second a destructive. The constructive movement was the great High Church revival. In its essence it was originally a movement for a deeper and more spiritual life. No one can doubt that its originators, Newman, Pusey and Keble, thought that by raising the idea of the Church and the sacraments they were deepening religious life and reverting to primitive Christianity. The final consequences were not then foreseen, nor indeed for many years after. The earlier teachers of high sacerdotal doctrine were godly men practising much

self-denial, and introducing among the easy-going Anglican clergy a type of religion modelled on the best ages of monastic life. Even we who are strong Protestants will gladly allow that the aims of that party were pure in their inception. Their mistake was that they exalted the teaching of "the Fathers" above that of the Scriptures. They made the Church of the fourth and fifth centuries their model, not the Church of the New Testament; and as the movement went on it steadily tended towards the Roman type, and practically became a religion of priests and sacraments, rather than one of faith in and obedience to Christ. Looking back upon it now, after two generations have passed, we see that it produces the same kind of fruit as it did before the Reformation in all Roman Catholic countries. A priestly caste usurps the prerogatives of the King and Head of the Church. The responsibility of the individual believer is handed to "a priest," and enfeeblement of the mind and conscience is the inevitable result. The ultimate outcome in all countries that adopt sacerdotalism is the decay of individual responsibility to God, and widespread infidelity among the nation's manhood. Men will not believe that their eternal destiny depends upon absolution by "a priest" who may be, and often is, a poor weak and erring mortal; and sooner or later a fierce revolt ensues. I fear that already widespread agnosticism has followed from the sacerdotal movement in England.

Unhappily, another cause has widely sapped belief in the Free and Evangelical Churches: I allude to Biblical Criticism. This has been carried to such lengths that many have concluded there is no certitude in the Christian religion. Not only is the Old Testament pulverized by destructive criticism, but the plainest statements of the Four Evangelists are questioned, and multitudes of untrained minds imagine that books like *Robert Elsmere* dispose of all miracle, and especially of the chief miracle of all—the Resurrection of our Blessed Lord. There was a time (happily now passing) when unbelief ruled the scientific world. Huxley, Tyndall, and Darwin were supposed to have demolished supernatural religion. This phase has passed away, and the greatest scientists, like Lord Kelvin, Sir George Stokes, the late Prof. Adams, and others are evangelical believers; but the destructive effects of evolution theories have sunk into the masses and the constructive side of modern science has not yet been popularized.

These are but hasty generalizations. One can only glance in a short address like this at the intellectual movements of the age, but I feel that some reference is due to the lamentable decline in attendance at public worship, which all deplore. I cannot give statistics; but it is beyond doubt that the majority of our male population can no longer be classed as worshippers at any shrine. The Sunday has ceased with most to be a holy day; it is a day of amusement to the masses, at all events in the Metropolis and the chief provincial towns. Three institutions which used to be sheet-anchors of the Christian faith: "God's house," "God's Day," and "God's Word," are all neglected by the bulk of our town population, and by many of the rural population as well. And now I ask myself: have we any hope to hold out

of permanent improvement? Or is the nation going the way of the great empires of antiquity, which all perished of internal decay?

Before answering this question I would interpolate the remark that one side of the national life has not deteriorated, that of practical benevolence, as shown in the care of the weak and suffering. There has been a great increase of charity in recent years. Hospitals and institutions of all kinds for the helpless and destitute have immensely increased, and large numbers of people freely give of their means and labour to this form of philanthropy. The administration of the Poor Law has been greatly humanized, and so far as the State is concerned, its action is far more humane than it used to be. Immense benefits have come from the great extension of Local Government. Sanitation is far better, the conditions of life are much easier for the labouring classes, and gross abuses of all kinds are checked by law. If man is simply contemplated as a citizen of this world his lot has greatly improved: it is on the spiritual side that we find retrogression. These two movements have been going on side by side for many years. The earthly environment has been improved, while the spiritual and heavenly has declined. I do not underrate public duty in regard to secular things. Man has his material side, and it is just and right that it claim its due share; but our Blessed Lord says: "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." The mistake is in thinking that the mere outer environment is everything, and that the inner life of the soul is but a dream. Unfortunately this is the current philosophy of multitudes nowadays, and the question is, do we possess recuperative power to regain the higher life on a large and national scale?

No one can pretend to certitude on such a question. But I am not despondent. I think I see signs that portend what we may call a national revival of religion. The trials which the nation has passed through have sobered it. There is much less of the spirit of boastfulness, and there is a great increase of the spirit of patriotic self-sacrifice. Multitudes have freely offered themselves for the service of their country; and all that involves self-sacrifice elevates a man. Furthermore the death of our noble Queen has deeply impressed the nation with the power of Christian character. It is obvious, and allowed by all, that the splendid devotion to duty which distinguished Queen Victoria drew its inspiration from the deep roots of personal religion. The merely material view of life has been rebuked by the spectacle of the best of all our Sovereigns drawing her strength from the verities of the Christian Faith. The two greatest lives of last century—greatest in their widespread influence, in their long duration, in their deep inmost loyalty to Christ—were Queen Victoria and William Ewart Gladstone. Widely differing in many things and representing two opposite and almost contrasted types of religion, yet both bowed the knee to the same Heavenly Master. To each of them "the things seen were but temporal, the things unseen were eternal." I feel sure that the influence of these lives has not died. It lives, and will bless this coming century.

I think I see a decided ebb in the tide of unbelief and a greater openness to admit the claims of Christ. What may be called blatant atheism has quite gone down. The evil now is not so much reasoned infidelity as indifferentism. The common people acknowledge a good life when they see it; and whether it is Bishop Ingram in the East End of London (now Bishop of London), or Hugh Price Hughes in the West End, they readily perceive and admire true consecration of life.

I think I note also a marked return to what I may call rational orthodoxy among the Free Churches. A generation ago the tendency was the other way. It looked as if large sections of the Christian world were losing their hold of the supernatural side of religion, and substituting mere humanitarianism for the faith of Christ. This movement is arrested, and the action of the Free Church Council is all for evangelical belief. But certain new elements are finding a place in the conception of the Christian faith which the harder doctrinal systems of earlier ages almost shut out. It is now perceived by many that the Sermon on the Mount is an integral part of the Christian faith as well as the Gospel of St. John and the Epistle to the Romans. The words "Believe in Christ" are not dissociated from the words "Follow Christ," as they have too often been. "Christ for us" is rightly conjoined with "Christ in us." These sharp doctrinal definitions which shut out large sections of Christ's practical teaching because they did not logically harmonize with their theological formulas are being modified or abandoned. It is seen that Christianity is a life as much as a creed, and that a creed is worthless without a life, just as a life needs the support of a living creed. "What God has joined together let not man put asunder." We are seeing that religion is many-sided, and that great varieties in its manifestation are part of God's design, that He never meant it to be a tame repetition of certain shibboleths, but an ever-living spring of life and love. The writings of the American author, Charles M. Sheldon, supply a much needed corrective to the Westminster Confession and the Thirty-nine Articles. They show the utter hollowness of nominal Christianity, i.e., of faith without works. There was need for this. Even the best things get corrupted in time, and Evangelical Christianity, which is true and scriptural, tends to become a form of sound words rather than a holy, self-denying life. No form of genuine and vital religion can afford to do without cross-bearing. Christ's words are everlastingly true: "If any man will come after Me let him deny himself and take up his cross daily and follow Me." "He that loveth his life shall lose it, and he that loseth his life for My sake shall find it." If I had to choose between the pious monks of the Middle Ages and a dead Protestantism I would much prefer the former. But we are not called to either alternative:

> The trivial round, the common task
> Will furnish all we ought to ask:
> Room to deny ourselves, a road
> To bring us daily nearer God.

The common life of man, the sweet family ties, the loving service of

our brethren, afford all the help needed to climb to heaven. Our Lord has consecrated common life by living it Himself, and we can best honour Him by following His example.

I look with great satisfaction on the wonderful growth of the Christian Endeavour movement. It takes hold of the young at the impressionable time of life. It supplies wholesome companionship when the character is plastic and easily moulded for good and evil. It keeps up the study of Holy Scripture, and encourages the young to make a confession of faith and discipleship. The three millions of members already enrolled are a mighty army for good. They mean Christian citizenship and national righteousness wherever their influence goes. The United States is the home of this movement: over two millions of members are found there. It suits the active practical character of our American cousins, but it is spreading here also, with excellent results. I grieve that it is so much confined to the Free Churches: why should it not spread equally in the National Church? I fear the reason is the growth of priestly doctrine and the discouragement of religious work by laymen, which always follows sacerdotal teaching. The Christian Endeavour movement is a preservative against priestcraft. It emphasizes the Lord's words: "Where two or three are gathered in my name there am I in the midst of them"; also these other words, "Let your light shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father who is in heaven."

To be a Christian is not only to believe in Christ, but to work for the incoming of Christ's Kingdom. "*Laborare est orare.*" "He prayeth best who loveth best, all things both great and small." "Inasmuch as ye have done it to the least of these My brethren, ye have done it unto Me." The Christian life has two sides, the contemplative and the active. We must have both if we are to be perfect. We must have something of Thomas à Kempis and something of Shaftesbury and Wilberforce. The good feature of the present age is its widespread benevolence: the bad side its secularity. Let the Christian Endeavour shoot the golden thread of Christ's love across the earthly pattern of human kindness; let it unite the things of time to the things of eternity, the knowledge that comes of man to the faith that comes of God; and so realize the words of our great poet:

We have but faith: we cannot know;
  For knowledge is of things we see;
  And yet we trust it comes from Thee,
A beam in darkness: let it grow.

Let knowledge grow from more to more,
  But more of reverence in us dwell,
  That mind and soul, according well,
May make one music as before.

* * * * *

And now I must bring this work to a conclusion, hoping that I have not unduly taxed my readers. One further reflection I may make. The rules of debate framed this year will rob Parliament of much of its interest to the independent member. It puts almost all the time of the House at the disposal of the Government. When I entered Parliament it was widely different. We had all the Tuesdays and most of the Fridays up till Whitsuntide, and many other opportunities of raising debates. By utilizing these advantages I secured a considerable number of entire sittings of the House for the discussion of great questions that lay outside the scope of party politics; such, for instance, as the Armenian massacres, the poverty and famines of India, the drink trade of India, the opium trade, the need of evening Continuation schools, the question of Ritualism, and several others. When the entire sitting of the House is taken up with such subjects, you ensure their discussion all over the country, for a thousand papers report the debate next morning, and millions of readers have it brought to their attention. Then the weekly and monthly magazines are sure to take it up. Your real object is not so much to influence the hundred or two hundred members that hear you, as to rouse the country to great issues, and through it to enforce on Parliament the need of legislative or administrative changes. You find the reflex influence of a great debate in the changed tone of many of the members who receive communications from their principal supporters, showing how interested their constituency is in these questions. I have seen over and over again that questions which had little interest for the ordinary politician, and which no Government would touch of its own accord, thus forced themselves to the front till it was a necessity to deal with them.

In this way most of the great reforms of the nineteenth century were carried. It was the action of Wilberforce and Buxton in Parliament, long before it became a party question, that led to the abolition of the slave trade; it was the action of Romilly that led to the reform of our cruel and, I might almost say, our savage criminal law; it was the annual motion of Mr. Grote that led to vote by ballot; it was Lord Ashley's (afterwards Lord Shaftesbury) repeated exposures of the cruel treatment of children in mines and factories that led to the enactment of the Factory Acts; it was Cobden's lucid demonstration of the advantages of Free Trade in repeated debates in Parliament that converted Sir Robert Peel and ultimately the whole country. In

these days private members had almost unlimited power to raise questions on abstract motions. Now all this is so altered by the new rules that in future the House of Commons will be little else than an assembly to discuss the proposals and action of the Government. The utmost a private member can secure is an occasional debate between nine and twelve o'clock p.m., with the great risk of a "count out." As the papers will be filled with the reports of the long sitting that preceded it, there will be little report of the second sitting at so late an hour, and the country will scarcely hear the echo of it.

Yet I do not blame the Government. It was impossible to push through the vast and accumulating business of this country without taking up nearly all the time of the House. Many private members' nights were wasted or used for obstruction. The mere accident of the ballot settled whether the House was to listen to a question of deep interest, introduced by a man it respected, or be treated to puerilities by a Parliamentary bore who wished to advertise himself. Questioning had been abused so as to become a form of obstruction, and the adjournment of the House and endless amendments to the Address were used to stop legitimate business. It was a case where the good had to suffer for the bad, and liberty had to be abridged on account of license. It will, however, in the future restrict Parliamentary debate to the ordinary channels of party politics. Able and eloquent men will always be able to push themselves into notice by the usual methods of party warfare, but the rarer and more disinterested reformers who seek to remedy evils that lie outside party will find but few opportunities left. Their work must now be done in the press or on the platform, as is the case in most other countries, and Parliament will only intervene when it gets a national mandate.

Perhaps a word of apology is due to the English reader for my too frequent Latin quotations. My excuse is that my education was in the pre-scientific age, when the classics were the great instrument of mental culture, and the sweet music of Virgil, who links sound and sense as no other poet has done in ancient or modern times, has a special charm for me, as for all classical scholars.

Finally, I would ask permission to make my own the aspiration of the poet Lyte, and to hope that by the sympathy of my

readers and the Divine blessing this book may do something to realize it:

I want not vulgar fame—
I seek not to survive in brass or stone;
Hearts may not kindle when they hear my name,
Nor tears my value own.

But might I leave behind
Some blessing for my fellows, some fair trust
To guide, to cheer, to elevate, my kind,
When I was in the dust;

Within my narrow bed
Might I not wholly mute or useless be;
But hope that they, who trampled o'er my head,
Drew still some good from me.

* * * * *

Death would be sweeter then,
More calm my slumber 'neath the silent sod;
Might I thus live to bless my fellow-men,
Or glorify my God!

THE END.

ORCHILL, *August*, 1902.

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

APPENDIX

Appendix I

Rev. Samuel Smith *of Borgue*

We come next to the name of Samuel Smith, who was the immediate successor of Forbes, being inducted to the parish in 1792, and whose work was carried beyond the limits of the eighteenth and well into the nineteenth century. Samuel Smith, who was the son of a farmer in Balmaclellan, had previously been minister of Carsphairn, where he laboured with much acceptance for nine years. In coming to Borgue he came to what was to him a familiar parish, for he had as a young man acted as tutor in the family of David Blair, of Borgue, and it was likely through his influence that he was translated from the Dan of the Stewartry to its Beersheba. For twenty-four years he here fulfilled the duties of the pastoral office with great ability, devotion and earnestness. He is still spoken of by some of the oldest inhabitants of the parish who remember seeing him as children, and who frequently heard their parents speak of him as an exceptionally "clever" minister. He appears to have been an all-round and versatile man, able as a scholar, faithful as a visitor, shrewd as an observer, interesting as a conversationalist, and eloquent as a preacher. It was owing to this combination of faculties that he succeeded, as he did, in drawing and retaining around him a large and attached congregation. He was a special favourite, we have been told by a parishioner, on Communion Sundays, when large crowds gathered together within the precincts of the churchyard. So long as he was preaching from the tent, erected on these occasions in the open air as a pulpit for the preacher, the people remained unmoved—unmoved in one sense, but much moved in another. They would not leave him for the church where the Communion was being celebrated, but allowed him full scope to play on their feelings with his eloquent and impressive words.

Dr. Hew Scott, in his *Fasti*, gives a description of Samuel Smith, which agrees with the traditional account. He speaks of him as "an able and interesting preacher," and one who "performed his official duties with great fidelity." He also refers to his physical features, and says his figure was "tall and slender," "there was a gentle bend in his gait," "he was of slow and deliberate speech," and adds that "he was a man of acute observation," "independent thinking," "extensive information, and liberal sentiments." Such features it is interesting to the present parishioners to see reproduced in his descendants who are still with us, and not least prominently in the grandson who bears his name, Mr. Samuel Smith, M.P. for Flintshire,

whose large-hearted interest in religious and philanthropic work is well known to all.

Mr. Smith's interests were not wholly confined to the special work and offices of the ministry, although all sprang from his love for his calling. It was his care for his people which led him to interest himself in their pursuits, and as these were almost wholly agricultural, questions regarding agricultural progress and improvement absorbed a good deal of attention. The fruits of his devotion to this subject were published, in 1810, in a volume entitled *General View of the Agriculture of Galloway*. It formed one of a series of agricultural reports on the different counties of Scotland, drawn up under the supervision of the Board of Agriculture. It extends to about 400 pages, and treats very fully of the state of agriculture in Kirkcudbright and Wigtown at that time, "including arable farming and live stock, estate improvements, and other miscellaneous information." The book has frequently been referred to by experts in terms of the highest praise. The Rev. Dr. Gillespie, of Mouswald, whose words we have quoted above, and whose opinion on such matters few agriculturists would dispute, has told the present writer that it is a "most interesting and comprehensive work." Mr. W. H. Maxwell, late convener of the county, also gave his opinion regarding the book in similar terms, when reading a paper on "The Agriculture of Galloway" before the Highland and Agricultural Society of Scotland, and now published in their transactions. He said, "It is considered the best and most reliable account of the condition of agriculture in Galloway at that time." In his own day and parish Mr. Smith perhaps did not get the credit or the praise which his book deserved, for, while much interested in agriculture generally, he is said to have paid no very particular attention to his glebes. And with reference to this a story is told that, meeting with a farmer parishioner one day, Mr. Smith advised him to get his book, which would show him "how to clean his mosses." To which the farmer replied that there was little need for getting the book when "I see the way you keep your glebes." Manifestly that man believed in practice before precept, or maybe it was only another illustration of the truth that a prophet has no honour in his own country. But Mr. Smith left better and more lasting monuments behind him than a book on agriculture. It was owing to his zeal and enthusiasm, and his unique influence over the heritors and landlords of the parish, that he was able to secure for himself and his successors a new church and manse. Writing in the *Statistical Account of Scotland*, in 1794, Mr. Smith says that both church and manse "are very much out of repair," and expresses the hope that the heritors will "soon repair them handsomely." Thirteen years, however, came and went before the not too eager heritors provided what the law now imposes—a dwelling house for the minister, "decently and comfortably furnished without and within." This house was not altogether new even then, for a small part of the old manse, which was built about 1740, was incorporated with the new, and is still in evidence. Twenty-two years passed before a new

church was erected. So that for several years the good minister must have felt, as he thought of a new manse, but a ruinous church, what David did when he said, "Lo, I dwell in a house of cedars, but the ark of the covenant of the Lord remaineth under curtains," and all the more anxious would he be to see built as soon as possible a worthy and becoming church, where God's praises might be celebrated.

Public bodies are proverbially slow to move, and apparently the heritors here had been in no hurry to gratify the wishes of the minister, although constrained to do so eventually. Perhaps they were wise in their delay. They wished first to see what kind of man the minister was going to turn out before they gave him a new house to live in, or a new church to preach in, and then, when they had made him "bide a wee," and perceived that "the root of the matter was in him," they fell in with his wishes, and rewarded his devotion. The sad feature of the story, however, is that while the church was built for Mr. Smith, he was destined only for the briefest space to do duty in it. Early in 1816 he performed the opening ceremony in presence of a large congregation, who were visibly affected as they saw the shadow of death on the face of their beloved minister, and listened to him as he told them that very soon the place that had known him so well would know him no more for ever. And so it was; by March 6 he was dead, and the temple here was forsaken for the Home where no temple is.—From *Borgue : Its Parish Churches, Pastors, and People*, by Rev. J. B. HENDERSON, B.D.

Appendix II

Extract from an Address by the late MR. GEORGE MULLER *on his Ninety-first Birthday.*

Set your mind on the things that are above (R.V.)

WHAT are these things that are above? First of all there is the glorified Redeemer—our hearts should be more and more taken up with that Blessed One who laid down His life for us.

There are the spirits of just men made perfect. More and more we should consider the blessed position in which they are now; how infinitely happy, how habitually free from pain, from affliction, from trial, from temptation, from sorrow of every kind; how habitually in a perfectly holy state, how habitually in communion with the Lord Jesus Christ. Oh, how precious!

Now, for us also, individually, is coming the day when we shall commence our eternal communion with the Lord Jesus, when we shall see for ourselves those precious hands, and kiss for ourselves those precious feet that were pierced with large nails for us; when we shall look that Blessed One in the face without the least fear or dread, and when this blessed experimental communion, on which we then enter, never more will come to an end. Five hundred years we shall have it, and it is only like the beginning; five thousand years we shall have it, and it is yet only like the beginning; five million of years we shall have it, and yet it is only like the beginning; it will never, never, never, come to an end any more. This is one of the things above; on this we have to set our minds individually for ourselves, and to say, "I, a guilty sinner, who deserves nothing but punishment, I shall for myself have experimental communion with the Lord Jesus Christ. I shall see Him for myself; I shall kiss His feet for myself; I shall look Him in the face without the least particle of fear or dread." Oh, what a prospect is this! Oh, beloved in Christ, let us accept for ourselves this loving counsel and advice!

Then with the glorified spirits we shall be in constant communion. The dear ones gone before we shall see again, and with them we shall have holy, blessed intercourse throughout eternity, looking then back on the life that is gone, and praising and adoring God for all the wondrous grace bestowed on us, and for all the numberless blessings and mercies that we have enjoyed during our earthly pilgrimage. Oh, how precious is all this!

And this is not a religious dream or fancy; We have a warrant in

the Word of God, and these things will be found after a little while, by ourselves individually, to be realities.

Set your mind on the things that are above. Oh! let us mind this. We have but one life, and this one life is a brief life in comparison with the eternity before us. And hence our loving Lord, who gave His only begotten Son, thus advises us, and His advice is given for our real true happiness, for God delights to see His children EXCEEDINGLY HAPPY.

Appendix III

THE SUFFERINGS CAUSED BY THE APPRECIATION OF THE GOLD STANDARD.

An Address by MR. SAMUEL SMITH, M.P., *at the Manchester Athenæum on Wednesday, February* 16, 1887.

THERE are many points of view from which the bimetallic question may be treated. When the mind is first turned to its importance the question of a fixed ratio of exchange between gold-using and silver-using countries arrests attention most forcibly. The suffering and inconvenience caused by the absence of this par make the strongest impression. The injury to trade and the hindrances to the transfer of capital from gold-using to silver-using countries lie, so to speak, on the very surface of this question, and nowhere are they better understood than in Manchester, the heart of the cotton industry of England, whose trade is mainly with silver-using countries. It was this aspect of the case which impressed me most strongly when I took up this subject ten years ago; but latterly I have come to the conclusion that there is another element of the case equally if not more important. I refer to the change of the value of the gold standard itself as affecting long-dated engagements and deferred payments. This second branch of the subject is not so obvious as the first; it deals with effects which are spread over long periods of time, and do not show themselves in the same self-evident manner as do violent fluctuations in the rate of exchange. They are obscured, moreover, by a mass of subordinate details which lie on the surface and catch the eye most vividly, and it requires a certain amount of abstract and concentrated thought to grasp the deeper issues involved. I think I can occupy your time to-night more profitably by dealing with this second branch, and trust that I may be able to throw a little light upon what is one of the most intricate branches of economical science. Commercial communities are constantly occupied with prices. The main business of a merchant is to watch all that affects prices. His success depends upon correctly grasping the course of the markets. The causes of fluctuation in prices are numberless, but the chief elements are the relation of supply to demand, and the state of credit and of the money mark When longer periods are under review attention has to be given scientific discoveries and economizing processes, and so abs

the ordinary commercial mind with these causes that it is difficult to get it to consider the influence on prices of changes in the value of the standard itself. For all practical purposes this last element may be dismissed from the ordinary operations of the market; it works too slowly and imperceptibly to affect transactions which are closed in weeks or months. Yet no one who has studied the history of prices can doubt that the greatest changes have been caused by alterations in the value of the standard itself. No one will argue that when a bullock fetched 40*s*. in the fifteenth century or wheat 12*s*. per quarter, it was simply the result of over-supply. All economists are perfectly well aware that it resulted from the excessive dearness of the precious metals, and this dearness was the consequence of an exceedingly small yield from the mines for several centuries—indeed, all through the Middle Ages. Again, when prices rose about fourfold in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries it is perfectly well known that it resulted from the discovery of the mines of Mexico and Peru, which immensely increased the stock of the precious metals and greatly lowered their purchasing power. In those days, it may be added, no great public inconvenience resulted from changes in the standard of value, for there were no national debts, no public stocks, or bonds of any importance. Each generation discharged its own debts, and did not create obligations for future generations. The custom of borrowing on a large scale began in last century and has been prodigiously developed in this one. The various national debts now exceed 5,000 millions sterling. The railway bonds, corporation debts, permanent or long-dated engagements of all kinds are simply incalculable. All civilized communities are covered with them, as some of our streets are with a network of telegraph wires; and it has become of the highest importance that the standard in which these debts were calculated, and on which interest has to be paid, should be as stable as possible. Now there is no way of judging of the stability of a standard except by comparing it with the average prices of commodities, the wages of labour, the price of real estate, and so forth. It is quite true that countless influences affect each particular article; a plausible reason may always be assigned for its rise or fall without reference to any change in the standard itself. No doubt in the Middle Ages, when prices were slowly falling, all the ordinary fluctuations could be accounted for by local and temporary causes; so when prices were rising in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Yet every modern statist knows quite well that the groundswell of prices over these long periods was the change in the value of the standard itself. It is not otherwise now. No century has witnessed such great changes in the value of the standard as the nineteenth, and none has suffered such great inconvenience. I would compare this alteration of the standard of value to the influence of ocean currents as contrasted with that of the winds and tides, which represent the temporary and occasional movements of prices; or to those secular movements of geology which have at one time given a glacial and at another time a tropical climate to this island, whereas the annual changes of season represent

the normal movements of price. This brings me to the part that I wish to emphasize, viz., that we have had three well-marked movements of price within this century, all three in large measure due to changes in the standard of value. The century was ushered in by very high prices, partly caused by an inconvertible currency, depreciated for some years twenty to thirty per cent.; partly caused by great scarcity and high prices for food; then there was an extraordinary and long continued decline, extending say from 1810–48 or 1849. This was brought about partly by the resumption of specie payments on the basis of the single gold standard, decided upon in 1816 and finally carried into effect in 1821; but probably in quite as great a degree by the action of other countries in resuming specie payments after the long Napoleonic wars came to an end. Concurrently with this the production of the precious metals was very small—that of silver being virtually suspended for several years owing to the civil wars in South America. At that time gold and silver were linked together by the bimetallic system of France, so that the two metals rose and fell in purchasing power as one mass. The extraordinary appreciation of the standard is shown by the fact that in 1845–50 £100 would purchase as many commodities as £224 did in 1809—that is to say, the purchasing power of the pound sterling had more than doubled, and prices on the average had fallen fifty-five per cent. I take these figures from Professor Foxwell, one of the ablest of our younger economists, and he adopts the index number of the *Economist* as his basis of calculation. Now, it is beyond dispute that this was the dreariest time in the history of England. Never was suffering so widespread or so long continued. Large sections of the working classes were half starved, and at times the country was on the verge of a social revolution. There cannot be a doubt that this distress was greatly aggravated by the prodigious fall of prices, or, what is the same thing, by the great appreciation of the gold standard; the huge national debt of 900 millions, contracted mainly in inconvertible currency, and representing, according to Mr. Gladstone, from one-third to one-fourth of the whole capital of the nation, was virtually doubled; its annual interest of 28 millions went twice as far in the purchase of all the requirements of life as it did during most of the period when it was being contracted. An unintentional, but most real fraud was perpetrated on the nation in favour of the fundholders—a very limited class in those days. The same aggravation of incidence applied to all other permanent or long-standing debts. The general effect was that the idle class, living on interest or annuities, was immensely and unjustly favoured at the expense of all the rest of the nation. It has often been matter of surprise to me that historians and economists who described that gloomy time attached so little weight to this all-important subject. I venture to say that had the gold discoveries of Australia and California been antedated by forty years, the history of that period would have been wholly different—the vast prosperity which followed them would, in part at least, have been witnessed long before. Now we come to the second period

of English commercial history during this century—I refer to the time of large gold supplies from 1850–73,—which was by far the most prosperous epoch of English trade. Our exports sprang up by leaps and bounds, mounting from 63 millions in 1849 to 255 millions in 1873. Prices kept steadily rising; labour was well employed, often very scarce in the manufacturing districts; wages rose on the average fully fifty per cent.—indeed, when regularity of employment is taken into account, I question whether the money earnings did not increase seventy-five per cent. The natural effect of this rise of prices was the lightening of all permanent burdens. The National Debt became much lighter, as did all mortgages, permanent rents, and other money obligations. The only losers were the limited number of rich and idle people who produced nothing, but had a fixed income from consols and other interest-bearing securities. The gainers were all the rest of the nation—the industrious middle and working classes probably, ninety-five per cent. of the whole. Can any one contemplate this result without satisfaction? Was it not really good for the nation as a whole? The average rise of prices, taken from Mr. Foxwell's figures, I find to be as follows: The commodities which could have been bought for £100 in 1845–50 fetched £142 in 1873, showing a rise of forty-two per cent. Who can account for this rise except on the supposition that the enormous production of gold in those twenty-three years reduced the purchasing power of money? I say money, not gold, for the two metals were still joined together by the French ratio, and the purchasing power of silver fell exactly as that of gold. As I have observed elsewhere, an underground pipe connected the gold reservoir and the silver reservoir, and kept their waters at the same level, and the effect on prices was quite the same whether the gold mines or the silver mines yielded most freely. There exist no tests by which we can tell exactly how much of this rise was due to the depreciation of the standard, and how much was due to other causes. Some of the best economists, like Jevons, put the then depreciation of gold at fifteen per cent. I am inclined to think that it was considerably more. One may ask the question, Why did prices rise at all during this period except from the cheapening of money? We had during that period as much activity and competition in trade and manufactures as has ever been witnessed since. Steam, telegraphs, and railways were increasing *pro rata* as much then as they have done since. Scientific inventions and economizing processes were never more numerous; all these influences, which our opponents offer in explanation of the great fall in prices since 1873, were equally in force before that date. If they have caused, as we are told, the large fall of forty per cent. in prices since 1873, why did they not at least stop the rise between 1850 and 1873? It seems as conclusive to me as a mathematical proof that the great rise between 1850 and 1873, and the still greater fall since, have mainly arisen from changes in the standard of value itself. I repeat that most of the causes assigned for the great fall of prices since 1873 might have been equally applied to the previous period. Production certainly increased as

fast in the one period as the other, transport was always becoming easier and cheaper, new fields of supply were continually being opened up, inventions in machinery and economizing contrivances were as frequent then as afterwards, commissions were steadily being reduced under competition, and the general tendency of trade, we should have said, should have been to lower and not to raise prices. Had there been no gold discoveries, and had the yield of the precious metals continued the same as in the first half of the century, does any one in the audience believe that this great rise would have occurred? You all know the contrary; yet when we press home the converse and argue that the great fall since 1873 is mainly the result of the appreciation of the gold standard, how many are still incredulous! Now let us consider the third epoch of English commercial history in the nineteenth century—that commencing in 1873 and lasting till now. Do we not find the reverse process to that of the previous twenty-three years, with a strong resemblance to the gloomy period of 1810–48? I do not, of course, claim that the suffering has been at all as severe as in the first period, but it has been very great to all the industrial classes, as abundantly testified to by the witnesses before the Royal Commission on the Depression of Trade and Industry. Every one in this district knows that for several years prior to 1886 the cotton industry yielded almost no profit. Some improvement is now, happily, showing itself, but for ten years at least capital has had far less than its ordinary share of profit. The same description applies to the iron, coal, and other great industries up till the recent improvement set in. It is difficult to say what trade has not been depressed, and agriculture the worst of all. Nor have the operatives gained what the employers have lost. All the great trade unions echo the lamentable story of depression. It is true that in some of them wages have been fairly maintained, but the loss from slack time has been very great; and in some large trades, such as mining, wages have fallen enormously, while work has also been most irregular. I have never in my experience seen such misery among the artisan class in Liverpool as I have seen during the past few years. Now I wish to invite your attention to what I believe to be the key to this melancholy state of things. Taking the index number of 100 to represent the low prices of 1845–50, I mentioned that the rise was to 142 in 1873; from this it fell with little interruption till it reached 92 in 1885; and when the average of last year is struck I doubt if it will be over 90, or the lowest point touched for 100 years, with the single exception of 1849, when for a short time that figure was also reached. To bring out this truth more forcibly, let me remind you that our exports of British goods reached high-water mark in 1873, viz., 255 millions, from which they have declined, with occasional recoveries, till last year, when they only reached 212 millions. But the quantities increased so enormously that, adopting Mr. Giffen's table of computation, the total for last year would be over 350 millions, and possibly reach 360 millions sterling if valued at the rates ruling in 1873; in other words, the fall of prices may be put at forty per cent. This

prodigious fall has produced all the phenomena, though in a milder form, which characterized the first half of this century. All burdens fixed in money have grown much heavier. The idle and non-productive class have gained immensely at the expense of the industrious class. The fundholder, the mortgagee, and the moneylender have drawn within their clutches a large part of the property of the active industrial class, and there has been a sense of almost hopeless oppression weighing on the community for many years, which happily is being somewhat lightened at the present time. Now, I wish to call special attention to this fact, that never in human history has there arisen such a pile of debts and obligations of all kinds as in the present century, with interest payable either perpetually or for long periods of time in a gold standard. I have instituted some inquiries into this subject, but feel that a far better actuary than myself is needed to give anything like an accurate account of these debts. I can point out, however, a few of the main items, which are formidable enough. We have first a national debt of £750,000,000, with interest and sinking fund amounting to £28,000,000 per annum. The railway bonds and preference shares amount to £500,000,000, with interest averaging say four per cent., or £20,000,000 a year. Local and municipal debts are estimated at about £160,000,000, say, at four per cent., £6,400,000 per annum. Then we have the vast amount of mortgages on land; they can only be guessed at, as we have no public registry of such debts; but I believe £500,000,000 is a moderate estimate of the mortgages on the soil of Great Britain and Ireland. Let us take interest at four per cent., and that will be £20,000,000. Then we have the corresponding mortgages on house property, on factories, on ships, and on industrial plant of all kinds. No estimate is any more than guesswork, but I shall be surprised if the amount does not exceed £500,000,000; this, with interest at four per cent., represents £20,000,000 per annum. We have further to take into account the long leases with fixed rates of payment. In such a country as ours the value of these is prodigious. Many of the largest incomes are drawn from ground rents. It is well known that large sections of the Metropolis are built over on leases of seventy-five to ninety-nine years' duration. The same applies more or less to all our great cities or centres of industry. This may be regarded as a tribute levied on the industry of the country by the land-holding class. I am not aware that any accurate estimate exists of the amount, but I would venture to put it at thirty millions annually. We have next to consider the royalties on mines, which have been felt as a heavy tax of late years, owing to the very low price of minerals. These I have seen estimated at about eight millions a year, but I don't give this as a reliable figure; indeed, all the figures I have given above are mainly suggestions for future inquiry, which would need to be conducted by a society of actuaries or professional statists. I do not think we possess any materials at present except for rough approximations. In addition to all these, there is a very large amount of fixed annuities, pensions, life interests, etc., chargeable on most estates or payable by the Government. It

is well known that many of these estates have of late years hardly afforded any surplus to the nominal owners after paying interest on mortgages, annuities, and other fixed charges. I shall roughly assess the total of annuities, pensions, and other fixed charges not included in the other items I have dealt with at £18,000,000 a year; and this will make the total fixed charges, payable out of the industry of the country, about £150,000,000 a year. If we capitalize this all round at twenty-seven years' purchase, we find it represents a capital value of about £4,000,000,000, or fully two-fifths of the whole property of the country, which, according to the best statists, is now estimated at something over 9,000 millions sterling. Now, any one who reflects for a moment will see that this huge load grows heavier or lighter according to the scale by which the wealth of the country is valued. If the pound sterling represents a constantly diminishing value, as it did from 1850–73, this prodigious charge becomes lighter and lighter; but if it represents an increasing weight, as it has done since the free coinage of silver was suspended in 1873, then it presses more and more heavily on the productive resources of the country. Let me illustrate it in this way. Suppose no decline in prices had taken place since 1873, the capital value of the wealth of the country would have been much higher than it is now; but the burdens would continue the same, and a much larger share of the national property would remain with the industrial classes. My own impression is that the present valuation of national wealth is quite too high, because our statists have not allowed sufficiently for the enormous fall in the selling value of land, and of the industrial plant of the country generally. I believe much of the assumed increase of the value of the national wealth is illusory, as there is not sufficient written off for depreciation. Every one actively engaged in business knows that new creations of capital oftentimes displace and destroy equal amounts of old capital, for the finer machinery and more perfect appliances really render the older and ruder forms valueless; yet our statists, who are seldom practical men, dazzle us with incredible calculations of the additions to the national wealth. These additions represent the new capital created, but don't allow for the old capital destroyed, and so those valuations are too much like those of certain joint-stock mills, which stand in the books at a nominal price—about double the selling value of the plant. The practical conclusion I draw is that large deductions ought to be made from those calculations of national wealth, and if the pruning hook were rigorously applied to all exaggerations, and the actual selling value of the nation's property be taken to-day, I doubt if it would be more than 8,000 millions, instead of above 9,000 as Mr. Giffen and others put it. In that case the pile of debts and permanent obligations would represent about one-half the national property. But, as I said before, had the scale of prices ruling in 1873 continued till to-day, the valuation of the national wealth would probably be twenty-five per cent. higher, the total would be 10,000 millions, in place of 8,000 millions, and the weight of debt, in place of being fifty per cent. of the total, would be only forty

per cent. of the total. To put it in another way, the great fall of prices has transferred ten per cent. of the wealth of the country to the moneylending and annuitant class; it has increased the claim which the idle and non-productive part of the community has upon the property of the remainder by the difference between forty and fifty per cent. of the national wealth; it has to that large extent unjustly defrauded the toiling and hard-working masses of the nation, and has greatly added to the stream of social discontent, and so far weakened the institutions of the country and the guarantees for law and order. I again repeat that the figures which I have given are to be regarded rather as a scale of computation than as reliable data; if this paper leads to a rigorous statistical examination of the whole question, so that accurate data be supplied to the public, I shall be more than satisfied. We must not suppose that these changes in the incidence of debt are confined to England; exactly the same phenomena are showing themselves in most civilized countries. The feature of the day seems to me the steady growth of debts of all kinds, and the division of most modern communities into debtors and creditors, with widely-opposed interests. It is, of course, always the interest of creditors to make the debt as large as possible; and as they represent the financial, banking and capitalist class, who have the ear of all modern Governments, it is most difficult to get due consideration for the rights of the great majority. Yet unless this can be done, modern civilization may some day be overthrown by a Socialistic upheaving from beneath. So far I have dealt with this question on the broadest grounds, as affecting the whole community; but there are some particular classes of questions which are rendered far more insoluble in consequence of the change in the standard of value. The most pressing of them is that of Irish rents. These were fixed judicially for fifteen years at rates which were fair for both tenant and landlord had prices remained as they were two or three years ago; but a further fall of twenty per cent. has taken place since then, quite upsetting the basis of rent, and, as is well known to most of you, the agrarian settlement has on that account proved a failure. Parliament is placed in this painful dilemma—either it must enforce impossible rents by wholesale evictions and excessive social misery, or it must practically set aside a settlement solemnly arrived at only five years ago. This is but one of the innumerable dislocations caused by the disappearance of the old customary basis of price. All class differences are painfully accentuated, political animosity is increased, and the Legislature is called upon to dissolve contracts in a way that is most arbitrary, and which is very destructive of mutual confidence hereafter. In the face of all this misery I am astonished to see the glib and careless way in which many writers speak of the fall of prices as being a source of unmixed good to the community. Let us suppose, however, that Parliament undoes the Irish Land Act, unsettles that settlement, and decrees a new and lower scale of rents; it will certainly confiscate the interests of the landlord on behalf of the mortgagee. Few Irish estates will yield any surplus if another heavy reduction of rents takes

place; many would not meet the fixed charges; and so the gre
injustice would be done of handing over the property of the countr
to the moneylender, who under all circumstances is enabled by o
law to claim his pound of flesh. Ireland is a crucial case; but to
large extent the same holds good of much of the soil of Great Britai
You have the inability of the landowner to reduce rents adequatel
because his fixed incumbrances represent so much of his incom
These fixed incumbrances were based upon an old scale of price
which has passed away; but they continue unchanged, hanging lik
a millstone round the neck of the unfortunate proprietors. Th
agitation for the reduction or the abolition of tithe is largely due
the same cause. The farmer feels the pinch of constantly-fallin
prices, and, to save himself from ruin, struggles to get rid of burde
which crush him down. Other strong objections are brought again
tithes, especially in the case of the Nonconformists of Wales; bu
there is no doubt that the movement derives much of its force fro
the extremely low price of agricultural produce. I turn now t
another illustration of the confusion introduced into all social relatio
by the change in the standard of value. I allude to the urgent nee
of reducing railway rates. It is admitted on all hands that our rai
way charges are much too high, and that they seriously cramp th
commerce of the country. A very considerable reduction is calle
for, yet note what would happen if an Act of Parliament compelle
railway rates to be reduced say twenty per cent. Railway propert
is held by two classes—the ordinary shareholders, whose dividend
depend upon profit, and the preference shareholders, or bondholders
who receive a fixed rate of interest. The latter class represent muc
the largest amount of capital, but the law cannot touch their income
the whole loss must fall upon the smaller class, viz. the ordinary share
holders; and a reduction which would be moderate and reasonabl
if spread over the whole 800 millions of railway capital would b
virtual confiscation if restricted to the shareholding capital of 30
millions. I believe this difficulty will be found to be almost insuper
able in the rearrangement of railway rates, and the commerce of thi
country will continue to be burdened with a scale of charges which ar
quite too high for the low scale of prices which now rule. One con
cluding illustration may be given of the wrong done by a change i
the standard of value. I allude to the case of the Egyptian bond
holders. The debt of Egypt was contracted during a period of great
prosperity and high prices; since then the price of Egyptian produce
has fallen prodigiously. Wheat, cotton, beans, and other products
of the Nile Valley are worth little more than one-half of what they
were worth in 1860–75, when most of the debt was contracted, and
the payment of interest for the past ten years has been an insupport
able burden on that oppressed country; yet the bondholders, by a
European engagement styled the law of liquidation, have been enabled
to squeeze out of the unhappy peasantry some four millions sterling
a year, though to raise that tribute they required to sell nearly double
the produce they needed to do ten or fifteen years ago. The interest

of the debt, measured by the price of everything grown in Egypt, has really grown in weight by fifty per cent. In the same way the Indian Gold Debt of fifteen millions a year, payable in England, involves the sale of fully a third more Indian produce than was needful ten or fifteen years ago in order to liquidate it. The weight of the debt has been virtually increased to that extent, and the financial arrangements between England and India have become strained and difficult in the highest degree. But I may be told that England is the chief gainer by the appreciation of the gold standard, because she is the great creditor nation, whose income from abroad is chiefly payable in gold. The time was when this argument was always trotted out by our opponents, and was thought to be a valid answer to every objection. Let us see what force there is in it. No doubt a vast amount of British capital is invested abroad ; this part of the national wealth is increasing much faster than the portion invested at home. The profits on foreign investments are much larger, and there is not that excessive competition which there is among all home industries. It is several years since the income from foreign investments was put at 60 millions a year. I should not be surprised if it were now nearly 100 millions annually ; but the extraordinary mistake is made by some in supposing that all this consists of securities whose interest is payable in gold ; a very large part of British investments abroad are in silver-using countries ; those in India alone have been estimated at 300 millions sterling ; and probably the greater part of all our foreign investments are not in interest-bearing securities at all, but consist of real estate and industrial plant of all kinds, such as tea, coffee, and indigo plantations, sheep runs, cattle ranches, gold and silver mines, manufactories, railways, steam companies, banks, etc., indeed, a great part of the commerce of the poorer countries of the world is carried on by British capital, and the profits upon the capital are remitted to the owners in the form of produce, and this accounts mainly for the immense surplus of imports over exports, which is the principal feature of British trade. It matters nothing to the owners of the capital what the currencies of those countries may be—they may be either gold or silver, or inconvertible paper ; but the profits on their capital are reaped all the same, and are remitted to England or reinvested, as suits them best. Of course I do not deny that a large amount of interest is payable on gold securities. I think I have seen the total interest-bearing foreign securities put at 33 millions annually, a considerable proportion of which are payable in silver ; but even granting that the bulk of this is payable in gold, it must be remembered that it comes into the hands of a very small class of the community. Probably not one per cent. of the nation is possessed of foreign securities ; and who will consider the extra gain drawn by this small class as any compensation for the suffering caused to the great mass of the nation at home ? The more this subject is looked at the more it is seen that the appreciation of the standard of value in any country benefits a far smaller number of people than it injures ; it makes a small class of rich people still richer, and robs the

hard-working, toiling, industrious class, for the benefit of t
toil not, neither do they spin." I hope that what I hav
be considered sufficient proof of the sufferings caused by t
ation of the gold standard; and I will, in conclusion, a
consider what relation this bears to the subject of b
and how far bimetallism offers a remedy for those sufferin
are still some who boldly assert that there is no appreciat
gold standard, and that the fall of prices is wholly due to ot
I beg such persons to consider the following facts. The go
tion, which for some years exceeded 30 millions annually,
to 19 millions a year; and the best Continental authoritie
Soetbeer and Laveleye, reckon that more than half that
consumed in the arts; it may, therefore, be reckoned
1873 only some 10 millions of gold on the average has beer
for currency purposes. But Germany during that period
duced a gold currency of 80 millions, the United States ha
specie payments and has used up 100 millions, and Italy
some 20 millions for a similar purpose; so that 200 millions
withdrawn for these special purposes, whereas the whole
new gold for coinage has not exceeded, in that time, 13
The balance must have been drawn out of existing stocks.
a steady drain of some 4 millions a year has gone to Indi
depleting the stocks in Europe. One result of this state
is that hardly any new coinage of gold is now taking pla
of the Mints of Europe are almost ceasing to coin new mo
while trade and population constantly grow and demand mo
currency, there is a steadily-diminishing quantity to meet
put the present production of gold at 19 millions a year a
quirements of the arts at 8 to 10 millions a year, while th
Indian demand is 4 millions, there is only left 5 to 7 millio
for new coinage for all Europe, America, and the British
It will seem to subsequent ages the height of folly that ju
period, when gold was running short, the chief States of
decided to close their mints against silver, and cut off, so
one half the money supply of the world from performing
functions. The silver supply for the last thirteen years
about equal to the gold supply; by a providential arr
when the one metal fell off the other increased corresp
and had the world continued to us both metals as freely
the painful crisis we have passed through would have b
mitigated; but by a suicidal policy silver was cast off at
time when it was most needed, and a double burden thrown
just when it was only able to bear half its former burden.
marck has well said, two men were struggling to lie under
only big enough for one. The truth is the total supply of th
metals would have been small enough had silver been kept
footing. The very rapid increase of modern trade needs a co
increasing supply of money to keep prices stable. We sh
doubt, have seen a fall even if the old bimetallic system

tinued ; it is a notable fact that even silver-using countries like India have seen a fall of prices since 1873, but the fall has only been some ten or fifteen per cent., against forty per cent. in gold-using countries. I consider that it is immaterial whether we speak of the appreciation of gold or the depreciation of silver ; what we mean is that the value of the one metal has risen relatively to the other. Had the old bi-metallic system of the Continent not been altered, the fall of prices in gold-using countries like England would have been lessened, and that in silver-using countries like India would have been increased ; in fact, an equal fall would have taken place in all countries alike. Allowing that there are about equal values of the two metals in the world, in place of gold values falling forty per cent. and silver values ten per cent., there would have been an average fall of twenty-five per cent. all round ; that is to say, we should have saved the last fifteen per cent. of fall, which has cut into the quick, and carried multitudes over the line which separates solvency from insolvency. Now, how stands the matter with regard to the future ? Will things rectify themselves, as the orthodox economists of this country are in the habit of saying ? It is quite true that a revival of trade has set in, which may for a season give relief and withdraw attention from the malady. No one could be so foolish as to say that there never could be periods of good trade, even under the pressure of a contracted currency. The wonderful elasticity of the industrial machine will assert itself even against crushing burdens. Almost unbroken depression has reigned for ten or twelve years, and a temporary improvement is due, whatever mistakes may be made in monetary legislation ; but I believe the improvement will not be long continued if we persist in our present suicidal policy. The silver question remains suspended over us, and the recent rise that has occurred can be ascribed to no permanent cause ; probably it is due to a vague expectation that legislation in favour of remonetizing silver will spring from the Royal Commission now sitting in London. Whether this be so or not, it is clear to me that if the Commission fails to do anything, and matters are allowed to slide, we shall soon be confronted with a great silver crisis. It is clear that the United States will not continue their present illogical position with regard to coining silver ; they must either go back or forward ; they must either cease to coin or open their mints to coin silver as freely as they coin gold. They will gladly agree to the latter alternative if France and England join them, but they will certainly not do so alone ; therefore they must adopt the other alternative of closing their mints against silver. When this happens, a further cataclysm in silver will occur. India will remain the only great market open to silver, and we shall be pressed by its Government to close its mints also in order to keep the exchange from falling to a perfectly ruinous point. Unless we do so the Indian Government will become bankrupt, and if we do so silver will almost cease to have a value in the open market. All the misery caused by the first drop of silver, of say twenty-five per cent., will be repeated by a second drop equally great ; and, again, we shall see a heavy fall of gold

prices and a further vast increase of all those permanent b
have been alluded to. I do not see how there is any l
from this conclusion; it follows even from the premises
opponent, Mr. Giffen. He admits the great appreciation
holds that that appreciation must go on, and exhorts u
meekly. It may be, however, that the suffering peoples n
it meekly, and that the constant increase of pressure
burst the boiler. Now we of the bimetallic school urge tha
a safety valve sufficient to relieve this terrible strain.
ample and an increasing supply of silver, just fitted to
pressure on gold. The nations of the world, by a mix
versity and ignorance, have deprived themselves of th
ally; all now admit the unfortunate consequences of th
all alike wish that the past could be undone; but the
"Who is to bell the cat?" who is to take the lead in re
the monetary system of Europe and America? We kno
two of the greatest monetary Powers, France and the Un
are only waiting for an opportunity to rehabilitate silve
are absolutely determined not to act without us; and up
depends whether this miserable state of things be put a
prolonged indefinitely. My object is to urge Manchester
great and well-deserved authority to the true solution o
tion. The time was when Manchester spoke with a voi
all England listened. Cannot it now resume that positio
to this vital question, and lead England, and with Engla
lized world, to a solution of the most entangled and har
culty which has blocked the path of progress in this cent

Appendix IV

THE NATIONALIZATION OF THE LAND

By SAMUEL SMITH, M.P.

UP till recent years no such phrase as the Nationalization of the Land was heard in England. It is doubtful if the idea it conveys was even intelligible to the mass of the people. In other countries it may possibly have been used as a symbol of extreme socialistic theories, but to all intents and purposes it is only within the last three or four years that the group of ideas indicated by this novel term has taken any hold of the average British mind.

It can, however, no longer be said that those ideas lie outside the scope of public discussion: though it is true that very few of our leading statesmen have deigned to notice them, and, though few publicists of any weight have lent their advocacy to the cause, it cannot be denied that they are making way among considerable classes of the community, especially the artisans of our great towns. This rapid progress is no doubt owing very much to the wide circulation of that remarkable book by Henry George, of America, entitled *Progress and Poverty*, a book which I shall treat in this paper as the chief exponent of those views. It appears to me that our leading statesmen must no longer keep silence on this subject. Though it may appear to them too visionary to admit of serious discussion, it is being diffused so widely among the masses as to forebode trouble in the future, unless met by rational argument.

So far as I understand this novel doctrine, it is that the State ought to own the entire land of the country on the ground that it is the legitimate property of the whole community—that it ought never to have been alienated to private owners—that their rights are usurped, and must be brought to an end either by compulsory purchase, or by simple confiscation. Mr. George goes so far as to advocate the latter method, on the ground that private property in land is as immoral as slavery, and he extends his anathema not only to agricultural land, but to building land in towns, and argues that even a freehold on which the owner has built a house is as much a robbery of the public domain as the largest estate of a Highland Laird. He condemns not only the great estates of our aristocracy, but the small properties of the French peasantry and the homestead farms of the American yeomen. In his eyes the possession of any portion of the

earth's surface by a private owner is theft, and the stolen goods ought to be restored to the public that has been defrauded.

I am not aware that any body of British opinion has endorsed these extreme views. When the Trades' Congress last year advocated the Nationalization of the Land, I do not suppose they meant confiscation, and I question if they extended the term to property in towns. Probably their leading idea was the improvement of British agriculture; and I much doubt if they, or any of their sympathizers in this country have clearly thought out the subject, or perfected any plan for the acquisition of the soil or its cultivation after it was acquired. This phrase has a fine grandiose sound about it, like other well-known catch words, which take captive minds that have not analyzed the question or grappled with the real difficulties of the case. It has a delightful vagueness, which covers many shades of meaning, and makes it no easy task to analyze or refute it.

I shall, in the first instance, deal with the form it assumes in Mr. George's book, where he boldly recommends confiscation on the ground of the immorality of private ownership. I do so because it is quite obvious that the State cannot acquire possession of the soil at full market value without to a certainty making a loss on the transaction, as was well shown by Professor Fawcett in his Liverpool address some two years ago. It is plain to me that as this agitation proceeds it will develop more and more into Communistic lines, and tend to assume the form of naked spoliation.

Now the main ground on which Mr. George makes this startling proposal is, that the land originally belonged to the state or community, and that it was wrongfully granted away to favoured individuals, and he compiles a brief history of ancient civilization to prove his point. I will go with him so far as to allow that before the earth was peopled land was not appropriated, and while population was very sparse it was not worth the while of individuals to claim special plots of land. The origin of all communities that we know anything of was the tribal state, when a clan or tribe, under a chieftain of their choice, roamed over a wide tract of country, supported by the produce of the chase or by their flocks and herds. Agriculture, in our sense of the word, did not exist in the infancy of the race. Our ancestors lived, as savage tribes do now, by hunting and fishing, and afterwards by pastoral pursuits; and so there was no motive for the private appropriation of land. But the point I wish to bring out is that usually private ownership of land arose when agriculture commenced, for the simple reason that no one would toil to raise crops which he could not enjoy. Indeed, so invariable has been the rule, that we may almost say that civilization has never made a commencement, or at least has never advanced beyond a rudimentary stage, till private ownership in land, or at least individual occupancy, was recognized by the law of the State. The necessary stimulus for cultivating and improving the soil was wanting, till security was given that he who laboured should enjoy the fruits of his labour.

But without going back to the dim and dusty records of antiquity,

we have only to take a survey of the condition of the globe to-day to prove the truth of my assertion. We still have in active existence every form of human society, from the most barbarous to the most refined. We still see a large part of the earth tenanted by races as primitive in their habits as our forefathers were when they were clothed with skins of beasts, and possessed the soil of this island in common. Nearly all Africa, considerable portions of North and South America, a large portion of Central Asia, the interior of Australia, New Guinea and many other islands of Polynesia are all in that state of primitive simplicity. In these regions the land is not appropriated; it is either the common possession of the tribe or the battleground of contending tribes. Now, Mr. George gravely assumes that all our modern poverty and degradation are the result of private land ownership, that all would disappear if we reverted to the happy Arcadian times when land communism prevailed; and it is natural for us to ask if we find an absence of poverty and degradation among those portions of mankind who have preserved the primitive tradition unimpaired.

Let us travel through Africa with Stanley or Livingstone, let us accompany our expeditions to Ashantee, or Abyssinia, or Zululand, in quest of the golden age of plenty—do we find anywhere even a trace of such social well-being as to be worthy of comparison with the worst governed country in Europe? Do we not find slavery, polygamy, the most horrid oppression and barbarous cruelty, the invariable accompaniments of this primitive state of existence? Do not famines and pestilences periodically desolate those tribes, while human life is scarcely valued more than that of the brutes? The Red Indians who once roamed over the North American Continent, and still hold large reserves in the far West, were all Land Communists; there was never private appropriation, nor, as a necessary consequence, was there any agriculture worthy of the name. These rude tribes lived by the chase, and a province that will now support, in plenty, a million of Anglo-Saxons, could scarcely sustain a thousand of these roaming savages. Wherever we find the land unappropriated, whether among Zulus, or Red Indians, or Maoris, or roving Tartars in Central Asia, we find a savage and degraded state of mankind, and we find almost invariably that the first step in civilization is coincident with the private appropriation and careful cultivation of the soil.

So far from the sweeping generalization of Mr. George being true, that human misery and degradation have sprung from private ownership of land, we find from actual survey of the earth at the present time that precisely the opposite is true—that human misery is deepest where the land is not appropriated; and human happiness and civilization most advanced where the land is held by private owners.

I am aware that it will be objected that other things than agrarian causes account for the progress of the advanced races. Christianity, science and trade have elevated Europe, while Africa remains in primitive darkness. This is self-evident to any ordinary person, but Mr. George virtually ignores all moral causes for social progress,

or treats them so lightly as to leave the reader to infer that
session of the soil is the only vital question for a nation's
that if this be secured to the State, all other things will rig
selves, and social perfection be speedily reached. The retort is
Why have those communities that have acted on his prin
thousands of years remained in primitive barbarism, while all
has been made by nations that discarded them ? The reason
Because they are not suited for mankind in a civilized state.
ever progress is made to a certain stage the land becomes appr
while at the same time arts and literature arise, cities are b
laws are framed. At that stage of human progress, wher
and polygamy prevail, where private rights are at the mer
chief or despot, where agriculture is unknown, and populatio
down by incessant wars and famines, we find the land unappr
Wherever these abuses disappear, and the garments of ci
are put on, then private ownership of land appears. The
or nomadic state is exchanged for the agricultural, and den
lations take the place of thinly-scattered tribes.

I am aware that some exceptions may be taken to this large
zation. I cannot go into minute details in such a paper as th
case of India will present itself as an exception to some of my
regarding which I will only say that the State, from time imm
has owned the soil of India, and leased it to cultivating
but so far from abolishing poverty, it has always been on
poorest countries in the world. Speaking broadly, I cont
the theory of human progress I have sketched is nearer the m
that of Mr. George. I hold that in place of private appr
of land causing the deterioration of mankind, it usually acc
their upward progress, and marks the first great advance f
barism to civilization. If this be true, the main plank of t
munist platform disappears, and the ground is cleared for lo
some other sides of the question.

But it will now be objected—grant that private ownership
is the law of civilization, the methods by which it was broug
were unjust ; large grants of land were made by kings to cour
favourites, great estates were gained by conquest and confiscatio
took the place of right, and the descendants of those " land r
to-day should receive no mercy. This is an argument we co
hear. What is the practical worth of it ? No student of
will deny that there have been many cruel conquests, many
ments of population, as weaker races were subdued by s
and one incident that usually accompanied those conquests
allocation of the soil to the conquerors. In this way the corp
old Roman Empire was transferred to the chieftains and wa
the rude tribes that overran it—the Goths, the Vandals, th
and the Franks paid little regard to the rights of the subject pop
The feudal system of modern Europe arose out of those co
and the land was conveyed by the chiefs to their vassals upon
tenure. In this way the soil of England changed hands, first u

Saxon, then upon the Danish, and lastly upon the Norman conquest, and that of Ireland some centuries later upon the English conquest. Very much the same process is going on at this day in all our colonies; the white race is gradually dispossessing the coloured races of their land in South Africa, in New Zealand, in Polynesia, while our American kinsmen have pretty nearly completed the spoliation of the Red Indians of North America.

These processes have usually been cruel and unjust, but it is the work of an archaeologist rather than a statesman to investigate the original titles by which most of the earth's surface passed to our ancestors. None but a dreamer could seriously think that modern titles should be impugned because Alaric, or Attila, or William the Conqueror acted unjustly. Modern civilization is the web woven of the warp and woof of conqueror and conquered, and it is well for humanity that time, which wears away all things, covers with the mantle of oblivion the rough processes by which they were knit together. Nations that are wise seek to bury the hatchet: it is only worthy of children to be ever seeking to keep alive race injuries that are irreparable and hoary with antiquity.

Indeed, those very processes by which the land of most countries has been transferred have been in truth the prelude to a higher civilization. No educated man can doubt that the Norman Conquest has made England a greater nation than it would otherwise have been, and every historian admits that the warlike tribes which overran the rotton and effete Roman Empire paved the way for the far higher civilization of modern Europe.

I dismiss, as the dream of Utopia, the idea that modern land tenures can be upset because ages ago they originated in conquest.

But again we are told that the feudal tenures of mediaeval Europe were very different from modern property rights; they were conditional on military service; the holder of a fief had to appear in the field with his retainers when called upon by his Sovereign; and these obligations, we are told, were unfairly commuted when standing armies took the place of feudal service. I reply, it is quite probable that the nobles made too good a bargain with their Sovereigns when the feudal system broke up, and the military baron was transmuted into the modern squire; but it is far too late in the day to overhaul titles on the ground of dubious transactions in the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In all countries the statute of limitations bars inquiry into wrongs after a lapse of years. In England forty years of undisputed possession is adequate to give a valid title, and surely two or three centuries should be enough to satisfy even a legal purist. Further, the greater part of the land of Europe has changed hands by purchase since feudal times; much of it has been transferred many times over. The State has in all these cases recognized the title as indefeasible, and I could not conceive a grosser act of injustice than to confiscate the property of a modern purchaser of land in England, France or Germany because some dusty parchment threw doubt upon a transfer effected in the Middle Ages. Were States to

act on such principles in all their dealings the world would be convulsed with strife; feuds between nations, between races and individuals would be endless; no settlement could ever be regarded as final, and modern civilization would perish as ancient civilization did in the smoke of internecine strife.

It is an undoubted fact that the first conditions of all national progress are security for life and property. Till those are attained no wealth can be accumulated, or no material prosperity enjoyed by the mass of the people. The wretched condition of the people of Egypt and Turkey to-day arises from the circumstance that no man feels secure in the possession of his property; consequently few will take the trouble to produce wealth of which they may any day be robbed. Now in all countries that enjoy settled government the first property to claim protection of the laws is that in land. All other industries hang upon it, and so long as it is liable to violent seizure there will be no industry, and no trade of any moment. I defy any one to point to a country where the title to the soil is violently attacked, where any trade or industry flourishes. In the South and West of Ireland, where land agitation constantly goes on, there is virtually no commerce, nor will there be any real revival of industry till there is a general acquiescence in the land settlement.

I could not conceive anything more destructive of the social welfare of any old and peaceful country than to tear up the foundation of all property by disputing existing titles to the soil. There have been times in past history when long-continued and cruel wrongs have furnished a partial justification for dispossessing a ruling caste of its property and privileges. Such a time was the first French Revolution. The old French *noblesse* had shockingly abused its power for ages. The ancient régime was rotten to the core, and the down-trodden people tore the rotten fabric to pieces, and shocked the world with their frightful excesses. The land system of France was remodelled as a consequence of that Revolution, and, no doubt, a much healthier system arose out of the ashes; but no one, save a madman, would wish to see a repetition of that carnival of blood. Nothing but the most desperate agony of a nation could justify or even palliate such a convulsion, and it would be absurd to suppose that there is any analogy between the just constitutional Government of England now and the grinding tyranny of the ancient régime in France.

But I pass now to consider another argument by which the Nationalization of the Soil is advocated. It is said that land differs from all other forms of wealth because it is limited in quantity, and not the product of human labour—it should, therefore, not be the monopoly of the few, but the property of the many. I reply that the productiveness of the soil is mainly the result of ages of careful cultivation. In ancient times most of this country, as of the Continent of Europe, was covered with dense forests, and it has been transformed by untold expenditure of labour into the smiling garden it now appears.

I can conceive no equitable reason why this form of wealth should not have the protection of the law like all other kinds. All wealth

may be called stored-up labour, and none is more valuable to the community than that which makes two blades of grass grow where one grew before. What was it that induced the hardy emigrant to settle in the wilds of North America, to hew down the primeval forest, and with intense labour and privation to turn the wilderness into a fruitful field? What, but the hope that he, or his family after him, would own a comfortable homestead? Could we conceive that no private property in land had ever been permitted, how would the continent of North America have been settled? How would the Anglo-Saxon race have been spread over the globe? What would have drawn the emigrant ship to the desolate shores of Australia and New Zealand? No magnet would have charmed the hardy pioneer of civilization but the hope of bequeathing a freehold to his posterity. And now, after vast regions have been settled on the faith of the solemn sanction of the State, it is coolly proposed to rob these people, or their descendants, of the land on which they have spent their life blood, on the ground that it should never have been granted to them. Could human folly go further? Well, the process by which the wilds of North America were reclaimed within the past two centuries is just the process by which our own and other countries were settled at a still earlier period. You will always reach a point in which human labour gave its first value to land, and without that labour it would have been as worthless as the soil of Kamskatgha is to-day.

Then we are told that it is the industry of the whole community which gives its high value to land, and that the community has a right to take back what it gives. On that ground the late John Stuart Mill advocated the retention by the State of what he called "the unearned increment of the soil."

I grant that in all old and settled countries land rises in value just as the community prospers, but so do most other kinds of property—railways, canals, house property, the public funds, and nearly all good and sound investments rise as the nation flourishes; and I cannot see in justice why one form of property should be singled out for attack. The motive that led the settler to clear the primeval forest was partly the expectation that population would follow in his track, and raise the value of his investment. But for that hope he would hardly have forfeited all the comforts of civilized life. Would it be fair, after he has cleared a pathway through the jungle for more effeminate followers, to deny him the legitimate fruit of his enterprise? Surely one of the greatest stimulants to material progress is just the knowledge that good orderly government will increase the value of property. It affords the strongest inducement to all the propertied classes in a community to avoid warfare and civil strife. Take away from the owners of property all hope of improving their position, and you abolish one of the greatest safeguards of peaceful progress.

But again we are told by Mr. George that private property in land reduces the labourers to the condition of slaves; that it keeps down their wages to the lowest minimum on which they can exist, and that

its tendency is everywhere to reduce the masses to a deeper and deeper degree of degradation. He says that modern civilization must perish as did ancient civilization, because it ensures the steady descent of the great mass of the people to a condition of hopeless servitude.

It is really difficult to meet such outrageous assertions. One would suppose that any competent acquaintance with modern history would show that the facts were all the other way. Nothing is more absolutely certain than that the condition of the great mass of the people in all civilized countries has been steadily improving at least for a century back. Let any one who doubts this read any impartial account of the state of our manufacturing districts during the Chartist agitation forty years ago, when the chronic condition of most of the operatives was semi-starvation; let him carefully examine the state of England during the Napoleonic wars, when the State took annually in taxation fully twenty per cent. of the entire national income against about six per cent. which it takes now;[1] when, as Sydney Smith said, every act of a man's life from the cradle to the grave paid toll to the tax gatherer. Let him remember that before the era of free trade the average wage of an agricultural labourer did not exceed 7*s.* to 8*s.* per week, which only sufficed to buy one bushel of wheat, whereas now it is 14*s.* to 16*s.*, while the bushel of wheat is 5*s.* to 6*s.*, that is to say, a labourer can earn two and a half times as much of the staff of life as he could then.[2] Let him read Mr. Bright's speech at Birmingham, where he compared the wages paid in his factory now with those paid in his boyhood, showing about eighty per cent. advance.[3]

[1] The average amount of revenue drawn from the United Kingdom in the period 1800–15 was 55 millions sterling, against an estimated total income of 250 millions; the amount of revenue received last year was 89 millions, or deducting post-office and telegraph receipts, which are not taxes, was 80 millions, which is in round numbers 6 per cent. on the present estimated income of 1,300 millions. It should also be remembered that while in 1800–15 we were adding to the National Debt at the rate of 20 millions a year, we are now paying it off at the rate of 7 millions a year.

[2] *Extract from* THE LANDED INTEREST AND THE SUPPLY OF FOOD, *by Sir James Caird, F.R.S., the greatest living authority in this country on all questions connected with Agriculture.*

"The general condition of the agricultural labourer was probably never better than it is at present. Compared with that of 300 years ago, in the time of Elizabeth, wages have risen sixfold, while the price of bread has only doubled. Two centuries later, in 1770, the farm-labourer's wages was 1*s.* 2*d.* a day, when the price of wheat was 46*s.* a quarter. In 1846, immediately before the repeal of the Corn Laws, wages were 1*s.* 7*d.*, when wheat was 53*s.* At the present time wages have risen 60 per cent., while wheat has diminished in price. In other words, the labourer's earning power in procuring the staff of life cost him five days' work to pay for a bushel of wheat in 1770, four days in 1840, and two-and-a-half days in 1880."

[3] *Quotation from Mr. Bright's Speech at Birmingham, comparing Wages paid in* 1841 *with those paid in* 1881.

Workers mostly women.

"Those who received 8*s.* per week now receive 13*s.* The next case is a class that received 7*s.* 6*d.*, they now receive 15*s.* The next is a class of workers then receiving 8*s.*, they now receive 14*s.* The next was a class of boys, who then had 5*s.* 6*d.* a week, and

Whatever test of national progress we adopt we see a prodigious increase of well-being since the beginning of this century. I believe I am within the mark when I state that the income of every class in the community has at least doubled in the last eighty years. The national income has increased from about 250 millions to 1300 millions, while population has increased from 16 to 35 millions.

No better test of a nation's material progress can be given than the consumption of food per head, and the annual death rate. I give the following table of consumption :—[1]

		1840.	1880.
Tea	ozs.	22	73
Sugar	lbs.	15	54
Wheat	,,	269	358
Meat	,,	84	118

With regard to the death rate no accurate return was made for England before 1840, but in London the mortality in the first half of last century was estimated at about forty per thousand (per Mulhall). Since then it has been steadily diminishing, till now it stands at 21·7 per 1,000. No doubt this is a fair index of the whole country. Then, as compared with the great continental nations, our country shows a decided gain. I take from the Registrar General's report the following figures. Average for twenty years :—

England	21·9	per 1,000
France	23·7	,,
Germany	26·9	,,
Austria	30·9	,,
Italy	30	,,
Spain	29·7	,,

The only countries that surpass us are the thinly-populated and healthy Scandinavian States, which is not to be wondered at.

Now, to return to Mr. George, his allegation is that rent eats up all the increase of a nation's wealth, that whatever labour and capital succeed in adding to the national production is immediately consumed by the idle and bloated landowners. I ask, is this true, or even partially true ? The facts are just the reverse ; the rent of land has increased far less than any other form of wealth.[2] The rent of agricultural land in the United Kingdom in 1814 was £49,000,000, now it is £69,000,000 ; the national income is supposed to have in-

they now have 9*s.* 6*d.* The last class were women in those days, but the employment is in the hands of men now. The wages were then 17*s.* 6*d.*, and now are 35*s.* 6*d.* The hours of work are also much shorter."

[1] Taken from article by Mr. M. G. Mulhall in the *Contemporary Review.*

[2] It may be said that rent was inflated by the war prices then ruling. This is partly true, but even in 1798 Pitt estimated the rent of England at 25 millions, or say 33 millions for the United Kingdom, which would give 16½ per cent. on a supposed income of 200 millions.

creased in the same time from 250 to 1,300 millions,[1] or fully fivefold, i.e., rent has increased 41 per cent. while general income has increased 520 per cent.; in other words, landlords, instead of taking about 20 per cent. of the whole income of the community, now only take 5½ per cent., and if their whole property were confiscated and divided among the people it would only add about 1*s.* in the £ to their income. Again: the rent of the land is only about half as much as is spent annually upon intoxicating drink; the working classes alone spend considerably more than the agricultural rent of the United Kingdom. A temperance reformation would put more money into the pockets of the people than the confiscation of the land, and it would do so without staining the national conscience or convulsing our social system.

One further remark I would make. Even if all the rent were confiscated and paid to the State in relief of taxation, the only effect on the poorer classes would be that they would get their alcohol, tobacco and tea cheaper. They pay scarcely anything to the State except through taxes on these three articles. Would any one be insane enough to hold that cheap whiskey, beer, tobacco and tea would extinguish poverty, or even reduce it perceptibly?

It is singular that so acute a reasoner as Mr. George entirely overlooks the main reason why rent is restrained from rising indefinitely in such a country as Great Britain. I refer to our free-trade policy. He argues as if a country must subsist exclusively upon its own produce, and so as population increases and presses upon the resources of the soil, landlords may exact more and more rent from a starving people. No doubt this is what would have happened had our old system of protection continued; had we prohibited the importation of corn, at least till wheat rose to 60*s.* a quarter, we should seldom have had wheat below 60*s.*, and sometimes at 80*s.* or 100*s.*, as happened repeatedly in the early part of this century; in such a case the growth of population would have brought us nearer and nearer to famine; indeed, it is impossible to imagine how 35 millions of people could have lived in these islands on home produce alone. But we have acted for forty years on the principle of taking all the food the world can send us, and the whole increase of our population during that period may be said to be fed with foreign food. The British landlord has no longer a monopoly of the means of subsistence; he shares it with the grain grower of Illinois and Manitoba, of India and Cali-

[1] Mr. Giffen, Chief Statistician to the Board of Trade, estimated, a short time ago, the aggregate income of all the people of the United Kingdom at 1,300 millions, but this is something quite distinct from the national production of wealth. Large classes of the population are not direct producers, though most useful members of society, and their incomes are drawn from the producers. For instance, clergymen, lawyers, doctors, literary men, schoolmasters, etc., and the whole class of distributors, such as shopkeepers; also innkeepers, publicans, domestic servants, army and navy, etc.

It will be seen at a glance that the national income thus estimated is something entirely different from the net production of wealth, which cannot be estimated at more than a thousand millions.

I take the estimate of national income in 1800 to 1815 from Leone Levi and Mulhall.

fornia. To all intents and purposes the soil of Western America is annexed to Great Britain, so far as food supply is concerned, and the price of the quartern loaf in London is really governed by the price of wheat in Chicago. We now import about two-thirds of the wheat consumed in this country, and more than one-third of our total food supply. This is the reason why rent does not increase as all other forms of wealth do; every one knows that of late years rents have considerably fallen, and it seems to me that as means of transport are always being improved, we may expect cheaper and yet cheaper food from abroad, and lower and yet lower rents for agricultural land; instead of the land of this little island being limited and a monopoly, it is virtually co-extensive with the vast regions of the New World, and is as much affected by their food supplies, as if it were towed across the Atlantic and moored alongside of New York.

In this connexion I would also refer to the idea vaguely entertained by many that another system of land tenure would marvellously increase the supply of home-grown food. Mr. Joseph Arch puts this possible increase at eighty-seven millions sterling, and the Trades' Congress seemed to agree with him. No doubt this would come true under the principle of protection; the excessive price of food in that case would admit of the profitable cultivation of much land that is now in pasture—just as the iron and cotton industries of America have been much increased by protection, that is, by a tax levied on the rest of the community, so would agriculture be stimulated by artificial prices, which would be a tax levied on the consumer; but it puzzles me to see how under a system of free imports of food we can force cultivation beyond the point at which it is profitable. Surely farmers and proprietors of land know best how to get the largest profit out of the soil; if they grow less wheat year by year it is because wheat growing will not pay in face of the enormous imports at lower and yet lower prices. If more of our land is going into pasture, it is because we cannot raise crops as cheaply on poor land as we can import them from abroad. No doubt it is true that much of the soil could be improved by drainage; but the question that every sensible agriculturist asks is, Will it pay? It can hardly be expected that men will court bankruptcy in order to please speculative writers who have no practical knowledge of the subject. Any trade when left to itself finds the most suitable ways of working. Men who have spent their lives in trying to get the most out of the soil are as likely to understand their business as mere theorists, and I assert that it is nonsense to suppose that any vast increase of food can be got out of our soil, in such a way as to compensate the labour and capital employed.

I have no doubt that it is possible to grow eighty millions more food in Great Britain, but it would probably cost 100 millions to accomplish it. You can hardly expect that any class would sacrifice twenty millions a year for pure patriotism. So long as wheat can be imported at 40*s*. a quarter, it is vain to expect that it will be grown on land where it costs 50*s*. The cost of production settles this

question just as surely as the law of gravitation settles how water will flow.

If the commercial history of this country has taught us anything it is the futility of fighting against the laws of nature, and the folly of trying to override economical laws by legislation. A great deal of what is written on the subject of land reform is just on the lines of the old protectionist theories, which demands that the State should compel a nation's industry to be turned to whatever direction it thought best. We hear it constantly said that there is a vast extent of waste lands that ought to be reclaimed, that the State should either buy or take them itself, and cause them to be cultivated. The simple answer is that they are not cultivated because it would not pay. Many landlords are great improvers. Many spend annually a third or a half of their rent in improvements, but so far as I can gather very few of them earn even three per cent. on these improvements. Indeed, I have rarely heard of a case where full commercial interest was obtained. Before the State enters on the gigantic task of cultivating several millions of acres of waste land, let it buy a few thousand acres, and work them as best it can. If the experiment pays it can attempt more ; if it fails, as I feel sure it will do, this foolish agitation will be silenced. The cry for the Nationalization of the Land is a reversal of the policy which all civilized States have been following for many years, viz., the liberation of private enterprise from State control, and the restriction of the State to those functions which properly belong to it. There was a time when the State claimed monopolies of various trades ; these it either carried on in a most slovenly manner, or jobbed out to privileged individuals with great political corruption. The India and China trade was once a monopoly of this kind, and the sale of tobacco, and management of railways, is still a government monopoly in some Continental countries.

Experience always proves that governments cannot conduct ordinary business so well as private individuals, and all sound and cool thinkers have for long urged the exclusion of the State from the sphere of private industry. The Nationalization of the Land would overturn every sound principle that nations have painfully learned by experience, and it is truly humiliating to all lovers of progress to see old fallacies of the crudest kind again raising their heads, as if mankind must for ever revolve in a vicious circle of error.

But let us assume, for the sake of argument, that the scheme has been somehow carried out, and consider briefly some of the consequences ; and I will suppose that the State acts honestly in the matter, and expropriates the owners of land at the full value of their property. I will make the concession that the State possesses the abstract right to effect compulsory purchase of any property that is necessary to the national wellbeing—just as land is taken compulsorily for railroads and other necessary purposes, and streets are widened or demolished in towns when necessary for the public good. I admit that there exists a power in the community to purchase, at a fair price,

the land of the country, if a clear and valid reason can be shown for so doing.

Let us, however, point out, in passing, what a ruinous investment it would be. The price to be paid, Professor Fawcett assumes, is two thousand millions. It is hard to believe that even so wealthy a country as ours could raise all this money; but if it went even so far as to compel the landowners to take assignments of consols, paying interest at three per cent., in lieu of money payment, it would lose at least one-half per cent. on the operation, for the land of this country does not yield a net return of more than two and a half per cent. Indeed, I doubt if it yields so much. Now one half per cent. on two thousand millions is ten millions a year, which would be a dead loss to the country, and must be raised by adding so much to the taxes. It is obvious that such a scheme would not work; the loss would have to be recouped somehow, and the first thing that would be thought of would be to raise the rent of the farmers so as to make up this deficiency. Now I have little doubt that the land of this country, if put up to auction, and let to the highest bidder, would yield ten millions more rent than it pays at present. Most British landlords take less rent than they could get in the open market. Many of the large estates are rented twenty per cent. below what could be extorted by open competition; the tenantry are seldom changed, and a kindly relation exists between the landlord and his tenantry which has continued for generations. All this would be reversed. The system of rack renting which we have put down with infinite labour in Ireland would be fastened on Great Britain, and would soon raise up in this country a storm of indignation at the cruel treatment to which the farming interest was subjected. It seems perfectly clear to me that the position of farmers would be far worse under a national system than under one of private ownership. There could be no abatement of rents in bad seasons, no permission of arrears to stand over, but a hard and rigid system of merciless precision must prevail.

You cannot administer a great department of State except by fixed rules. If you leave discretion to the heads of a department as to the rents they should take, the allowances to be made in bad years, the consideration to be shown to old and infirm tenants, to widows, etc., you would of necessity introduce jobbery and corruption wholesale. Such enormous power could not be entrusted with safety to any officials, and even the heads of the government would be under frightful temptations to use this prodigious power for either private or political purposes. Think of over a million of farmers in Great Britain and Ireland holding direct from the State, and at the mercy of a government department. Would no pressure be put upon them at election times? Would no promise to abate rents be given as the price of their support? Would not this huge State department become, what all similar departments have become in the United States —a hotbed of bribery? We know that with every change of government in America more than 100,000 officials are turned out, from the

President of the United States down to the humblest letter carrier. Would it be safe, as our government becomes increasingly democratic, to place at its mercy so vast an interest as the agriculture of the United Kingdom ?

Further, we would ask, where is the money to come from to improve the soil under this system ? at present a large percentage of rent is returned to the soil in the shape of improvements. I should not be surprised if over twenty per cent. of the rental of the land is returned to it in one shape or another, and probably another twenty or thirty per cent. is spent by the landlords in keeping up their country houses, and supporting a host of domestic servants, gardeners, gamekeepers, grooms and other retainers — not to speak of the custom they give to the country shopkeepers. All this great expenditure, which is the life blood of the rural community, would be stopped. The landlords, who would now be mere pensioners of the State, would have no inducement to live in the country any longer. They would drift into our towns, or live abroad, and bring all the evils of absenteeism on this country that have been felt so keenly in Ireland. The hosts of people that depend upon them in the country would starve, or have to add to the congestion of our overcrowded towns. A great decrease in the rural population would take place—the very last thing that any good government should desire. Those beautiful mansions, which are the ornament of this country, and which afford pleasure to multitudes of tourists and sightseers, historical places such as Chatsworth and Haddon Hall, would fall into ruins. We should have rudely torn down the social edifice which it took centuries to build up, and have left nothing to fill the void.

It may be said that the farmers would now become the improvers of the land, seeing that we have passed a Tenants' Compensation Bill. I fear little outlay would be made by them under the State as landlord, unless they got fixity of tenure and judicial rents, and I have little doubt that this would be the ultimate outcome of Nationalization. It would be found impossible to secure proper cultivation under the dreadful sense of insecurity caused by competition rents fixed by government officials ; it would be found that we were turning Great Britain rapidly into an Ireland, and we should have to resort to the state of things we have established there. So this very arbitrary system of judicial rents would have to be introduced. If it merely confirmed existing rents the State would lose ten millions a year, as already stated. If it recouped that ten millions by adding to the rents, the tenantry would be bitterly discontented. It would be a choice of evils, and the extraordinary result would be reached that under the guise of Nationalization of the Land, we should have constituted a new set of permanent holders of the soil, subject to a fixed quit rent, and the nation would have no greater control of the soil of the country than it had before !

Some may suggest that there are other ways of dealing with the land after the nation has acquired it. No doubt there are various ways. The Democratic Federation says it is to be cultivated by

agricultural and industrial armies, whatever that may mean; but I believe every one of them would prove utterly impracticable, and all would be vitiated by the political danger of entrusting so large a business to the management of a State department. There was an agitation some years ago for the Nationalization of the Railways: Some theorists held that the State should purchase and work our railway system. Most fortunately, as I think, this scheme was defeated by the practical good sense of the British people. But the management of the railways would have been simplicity itself compared with the management of a landed estate worth two thousand millions. No doubt bribery and corruption would soon have been rampant in the railway department, but that would have been a trifle compared with the powers that an unscrupulous minister might exercise over the vast agricultural interest.

I think I have now said sufficient to show that the scheme of Nationalizing the land is about as absurd as the South Sea bubble, or as any other delusion that history records. If it be carried out by confiscation, it would be the most gigantic piece of wickedness perpetrated in modern times; if effected by purchase, it would be the worst investment which the State ever made. Under no circumstances that I can conceive would it work successfully, and it may be dismissed to the region of Utopia.

I might have gone further in my attempts to explode it by pointing out that Mr. George recommends the confiscation of all the freehold land in towns as well as in the country, so that any house which the owner had built on his plot of land would virtually be confiscated to the State, for it is very evident that if the land were taken by the State, and it had the power of exacting whatever ground rent it chose, it would virtually be the owner of the house. An obvious reply to Mr. George would be that it is difficult to conceive that any person would ever be so foolish as to build a house again. No lease given by the Government would be worth a day's purchase, for after a State had perpetrated such a piece of iniquity as suddenly and without compensation to take possession of every freehold in the country, it would be a small thing to break any leases it might afterwards give. I would simply point out that every man who could save anything from the general wreck would flee from a country abandoned to legalized robbery, and the time would come within measurable distance when Macaulay's New Zealander would stand on a broken arch of London Bridge and survey the ruins of the modern Babylon. There is nothing more certain than if you set at nought the primary laws of morality, of which the eighth commandment is one, the descent to anarchy is swift and sure. It is vain to suppose that men who would confiscate this principal form of property would stop short at it; if a thief puts his hand into my pocket and tells me he will only abstract the half-crowns, but that the shillings are sacred, I will put both my shillings and half-crowns out of reach as soon as possible. The principles of Mr. George's book are already amplified by the Democratic Federation, recently formed in London, so as to include the repudiation of the

National Debt, the confiscation of railways, banks and most other forms of property.

The descent is rapid to the simple aphorism of Proudhon, the celebrated French Communist, that "Property is robbery." We may safely predict that if such views were spread so widely in our country as to lead to the return of many of their advocates to Parliament, the era of free government in this country would be drawing to a close. Long before such schemes could be put in force the propertied classes would do in England as they have often done in France, sacrifice liberty rather than run the risk of Communism. Some "saviour of society" will be found in all countries before Communism, which is another name for organized theft, is allowed to get the upper hand.

Liberty requires justice for her handmaid and due respect for the rights of all. It will only flourish permanently in communities that are essentially honest, enlightened and law abiding. As the suffrage in our country becomes wider and wider, and power passes increasingly into the hands of the masses, it is increasingly necessary that education in the highest sense of the term should be universal. By education I mean the harmonious development of all our powers, based on the immutable precepts of religion and morality. There is no doubt that demagogues will be found to appeal to the basest motives of the most degraded classes. In all ages men are to be found who are willing to prostitute great talents to the vilest purposes; men who, like Cataline of old, or Robespierre and Danton of modern times, would climb to power on the ruins of their country. We need not be astonished if schemes that combine the principles of Atheism and Communism are flaunted before the constituencies of the future, but I shall be much surprised if the sober commonsense that has hitherto distinguished the British people is beguiled by their enchantments.

Before parting with the subject of Land Nationalization I would point out, in a word or two, that not only the owners of land would be defrauded on Mr. George's plan, but likewise all the mortgagees, whose name is legion. Much of the land of this country is heavily burdened; probably hundreds of millions are lent on its security. As the State has encouraged the belief that land was the safest form of property, it has long been the custom of banks, Insurance Companies, Loan Societies and other agencies that gather up the savings of the nation to lend them on the security of the soil. The sole livelihood of multitudes of widows and orphans depends upon trust money so invested. It is difficult to conceive what frightful misery would be caused by suddenly pulling away the platform on which such a pile of obligations has been reared. The ruin of the landlords themselves would be but a part, perhaps a small part, of the general disaster. As when dynamite is exploded in a crowded thoroughfare, helpless women and children would be among the chief sufferers.

I must, however, before concluding, point out in a few words the direction in which true land reform must run.

I am not one of those who regard our land system as at all perfect. The proprietors are far too few, either for the social welfare of the country or for the stability of property itself. There were, in the United Kingdom, by the last Parliamentary return (that of 1872), 314,000 owners of more than an acre each, and 852,000 owners of less than an acre each, the latter mostly in towns. It would be greatly for the advantage of society if more people were interested in the soil of the country. The large estates are very much the creation of the law of entail, a law which is doomed, and is already in a great measure set aside. The ordinary laws of nature are opposed to the perpetuation of gigantic fortunes, either in land or moveable wealth. The heirs of the rich are often spendthrifts and dissipate what their fathers have gained.

The law of entail has overridden the wiser law of nature and kept estates intact, though the proprietor was bankrupt; that unjust provision is tottering to its fall. The law of primogeniture, which passes all real estate when entailed, or in case of intestacy, to the eldest son, will fall along with it, and liberty will be given to parents to leave their estates more in accordance with the dictates of justice. Then the system of limited ownership, which springs out of the law of entail, will disappear along with it. Many estates are starved at present, because the landlord is merely a life renter, with little power and no inducement to make improvements; that injurious system will pass away with entail. I would hope and expect that many of the large estates will naturally subdivide, and many of them will certainly come into the market as soon as entails are broken. The farmers also under the Tenants' Compensation Bill will tend to become fixtures, and if compensation be extended to the sitting tenant upon rise of rent, as is proposed by Sir James Caird and many of our best agriculturists, there would gradually arise something analogous to the Ulster tenant right, and we should have two classes, instead of one, permanently interested in the soil.

The assessment of mansions and pleasure grounds and also of waste lands in the vicinity of towns should likewise be adjusted to their selling value, not to their nominal letting value, which is often quite deceptive. There are large tracts of land allowed to lie idle in the outskirts of rising towns, like our own Kensington Fields, that they may be sold at a vast advance in price when required for building purposes. Some of our greatest fortunes have been made in this way, and yet these lands escape taxation so long as they are unoccupied. This is a great blot which must be removed.

I can see no reason whatever why the Death Duties, as Mr. Gladstone calls them, should be so very much heavier on personal than on real property. This most unjust distinction must be swept away; nor would I object to a graduated duty as estates increase in value. Besides this I have always thought that a difference should be made between income derived from fixed property and that derived from the labour—either of hand or brain—the one is certain, the other

precarious, and it is fair that the former should pay higher income tax than the latter.[1]

I am also in favour of extending the Bright clauses of the Irish Land Act to Great Britain, so that the State may be empowered to advance three-fourths of the purchase money to occupying tenants desiring to buy their farms; and I would give special facilities for the creation of small properties, say of ten or twenty acres, to encourage the more thrifty of the peasantry to acquire land, and to facilitate the creation of market gardens on a large scale.

It is also a fair question whether the State should not aid agricultural labourers by loans to purchase their cottages along with garden allotments. No one can doubt the immense boon to a farm labourer of a plot of ground he can call his own, and if any reasonable way could be shown whereby the State could facilitate this desirable result, without incurring undue risk, all land reformers would favour it. I have, however, little faith in the general extension of the French system of peasant proprietary to this country. Our soil and climate are not favourable to it. The habits of our people are radically opposed to excessive thrift, and discouragement of families, which characterize the French peasantry, and which are essential to the successful working of their system. Nations develop their own modes of life, and you cannot force imitations. We can as little copy the land system of France as she can copy our manufacturing and commercial system. The case of Ireland is different, and there I think that a peasant proprietary, arrived at by honest purchase with some aid from the State, may perhaps prove to be the ultimate solution of the land question.[2]

There is another point also on which I will partly go with the views of the Nationalists. I allow that property in land ought not to be as absolute as property in chattels. You may make and destroy a chair or a table, and no one has any right to complain; but the owner of land has no moral right to destroy its value, or debar the public from all access to it, when such access is no personal injury to himself. I think it is contrary to natural law that vast tracts of barren lands in the Highlands should be shut up against the harmless

[1] Since these remarks were penned Sir Wm. Harcourt's Finance Act of 1894 largely increased the "death duties" on real estate.

[2] This paper is written with reference mainly to land tenure in England, and I wish to add that I except the Highlands and Islands of Scotland from the scope of my remarks. Their condition is widely different from that of England, or the Lowlands of Scotland, and more nearly resembles that of Ireland. The tribal system existed in the Highlands till the middle of last century, the land being to a certain extent the common property of the Clan, though the chief had special rights of his own. After the battle of Culloden, the system of English law was applied most unjustly to the Highlands, and the chiefs were constituted absolute owners of the land, causing in many cases cruel injustice to a brave and honest people, who had shed their blood like water for the same chiefs. Many evictions took place at the end of last century and beginning of this as harsh as those which made the Irish Land Act necessary, and I consider that even yet some reparation ought to be made to a most loyal section of the British nation, and protection given to the "Crofters" on principles akin to those of the Irish Land Act.

tourist, because a deer-stalker does not wish his game to be disturbed. I would neither acknowledge nor permit such a usurpation. I would not permit the elementary rights of the earth's inhabitants to be sacrificed to extreme theories of game preserving. In the same way I would uphold the rights of town populations to common rights of way wherever practicable, and not allow them to be debarred from the enjoyment of the beauties of nature at the whim of landowners who may happen to be of a boorish disposition.

I greatly regret the abstraction of so many village commons in past ages, and it is fairly a question whether portions of these should not be re-purchased for the public good. Our town populations are far too much cramped, and I would take, by compulsory purchase, whatever land is required for recreation ground, or even, in case of necessity, for building purposes, and for the legitimate development of growing towns. The rights of landowners can never be so interpreted as to override the primary necessities of life for the toiling masses of the country. There will probably be directions, not yet clear to us, in which the State must do more than it has yet done to sweeten the lot of our labouring poor; and as these become plain, commonsense will impose any restrictions on landed property that may be shown to be necessary.[1]

Another important suggestion I would make is the compulsory registration of titles to real property, with an authoritative record of all charges upon it.[2]

One of the chief obstacles to the transfer of property in England is the cumbrous and costly process by which titles are verified. It operates very much against the multiplication of small owners. The State must do here what it has done in France, Belgium, and other countries — establish land courts to make transfers cheap and easy. I believe nothing would do more to multiply small owners. I would also establish agricultural schools, as is done in Switzerland and other Continental countries, where farmers' sons can learn the science of their profession.

In the Colonial possessions of this country I think that a most wasteful system of dealing with the land has been adopted. There we had the opportunity of applying sound principles of land tenure to virgin territory unencumbered by old proprietary rights; but we have allowed vast tracts of land to be alienated to speculative buyers

[1] I have not dealt in this paper with the evils of leasehold tenure in our large towns. I think the system of building houses on leases of 75 years, so common in London, is very disadvantageous to the public. The houses revert to the owner of the land at the end of the lease, and so he profits, as it seems to me, unjustly by the expenditure of others. Besides, there is no inducement to build solid and lasting habitations when the owner or builder of the house loses his right at the end of a term of years. The necessary consequence is that much of this property becomes almost uninhabitable towards the end of the lease, for it is nobody's interest to keep it in repair.

I therefore advocate some scheme for the conversion of leaseholds into freeholds on just terms to all concerned, in the same way as copyhold tenure has been gradually exchanged for freehold.

[2] This has now been adopted in the County of London with great success.

almost for nothing, and so have laid the foundation for even greater inequalities of wealth than we have in England.

It would have been a wise policy had our Colonies in America, Australia and elsewhere refused to give freehold possession to any but bona fide settlers, and not alienated more than 100 or 200 acres to any individual, and they might even have retained the right of imposing a moderate land tax, say of ten per cent., on its future annual value. No settler would have objected, when he was getting land almost gratuitously, to come under such an obligation. These new States would thereby have laid the foundation of a splendid revenue in the future, and would have kept their boundless stores of land for the relief of the dense population of Europe. Instead of that they have sold vast stretches of territory to squatters, to railway companies, to speculative land companies, and to foreign adventurers. Some of these men own millions of acres, and will pile up incredible fortunes from the labour of the toiling emigrants, who are compelled to apply to them for the right to settle on those vast domains. It is only the other day that I was asked to take a share in a grant of three millions of acres in an American State, which a speculative builder had received as payment for putting up a State house. It is easy to see that future agrarian difficulties are being created wholesale in the new countries of the world by such reckless procedure. It was, no doubt, this ruinous system of dealing with unappropriated land and the abuses of these land speculators which contributed largely to form Mr. George's opinions. The old countries of Europe are exempt from this special class of evils; but it is a great injustice that their emigrant population should in this way be cut off from much of the advantages that the new countries of the world would otherwise offer.

Our rulers were not wise in permitting the Colonies in their infancy to do as they liked with their vast possessions. They should have acted as trustees for our future population, and carefully guarded the rights of unborn millions.[1]

It is a question even yet whether our Government should not acquire and hold a quantity of virgin soil in Manitoba, Australia, or New Zealand as trustee for future emigrants from the old country. If we wait a few years longer these lands may all be appropriated, as is the case over most of the United States. It is a grave question whether the poverty of masses of our people may not compel us to adopt some system of State emigration, and it would be an infinite pity if we allowed all the vast domain acquired by the courage of our forefathers to be granted away, so that this country ceased to have any beneficial interest in it.

I must now bring these remarks to a close.

While I dismiss as a chimera the idea of nationalizing the land in

[1] To show the sparseness of population in these new countries, compared with the density of our own, I may state that if the soil of England were divided equally among its people it would scarcely yield 1½ acres to each person, whereas Australasia would give 704 acres to each person, and Canada 482 acres.

the old countries of Europe, I admit there is a possibility of doing something in that direction with the unoccupied portions of the world. I willingly recognize the philanthropic spirit that underlies this movement. I sympathize with its desire to elevate the poorer classes, and would gladly join in any practicable scheme founded upon justice which aims at that result.

I admit with deep sorrow that modern civilization has failed to eradicate poverty and suffering among large sections of the population. The struggle and strain of life with many is excessive, and if by wiser social adjustments we can lessen this, who would not thankfully welcome them ? but the causes of inequality of wealth lie deep in the foundation of human nature and the constitution of the world, and no laws can essentially alter them. Mankind vary enormously in natural and acquired gifts ; it is impossible to hinder a strong man succeeding where a weak man fails, or a wise man rising where a foolish man falls—till we can make men equally wise, strong and virtuous, there will be profound differences of condition just as there are profound differences of character. No laws can hinder a good workman getting better employment and higher pay than a bad one, a good physician or lawyer attracting crowds of clients while the dull and careless practitioner starves—the prudent merchant or tradesman amassing a fortune while the idle or reckless loses one. Modern civilization does not diminish but accentuate moral and intellectual differences ; it is more difficult for the idle, the improvident and the vicious to hold their own in the race of life now than in ruder ages—all our processes are more refined—all require greater skill and higher character, and there is an increased tendency to precipitate the coarser material to the bottom of the social edifice—hence we see in all our cities a huge and melancholy deposit of human wretchedness and vice. It is an honest desire to raise this sunken mass of human beings which accounts for much of the socialism of the day. Those schemes for compulsorily dividing the land and distributing wealth among the poor, are the outcome of mistaken philanthropy, but they will never succeed while such vital differences exist in the capabilities of mankind. The utmost you can expect of a State is to give a fair chance to every one, and free play to all the powers and capacities of its citizens—it never can, by any laws or social arrangements, produce equality of condition. "The drunkard and the glutton shall come to poverty, and drowsiness shall clothe a man with rags" ; "he becometh poor that dealeth with a slack hand, but the hand of the diligent maketh rich." These laws are unchangeable ; they have operated in all ages and all climes, and human legislation cannot override them, nor should it try to do so. Yet benevolence has its function as well, and much that the State cannot do ought to be done by private philanthropy. Where there may not be a legal obligation there is often a moral one, not less binding, to feed the hungry and clothe the naked. Nor am I one of those who would exclude the State altogether from the sphere of benevolence. The conscience of the community is impersonated in its Government, and I regard with

hopefulness the increasing responsibility felt by the State for the care of the weak and helpless. I expect rich results to flow from this principle in the future, yet we must guard against sapping individual self-reliance, and leading the people to look to the State as a Special Providence. Our strength in the past has sprung from individual initiative, and we must beware of weakening that mainspring of our national greatness.

Appendix V

THE ADMINISTRATION OF "BARRACK SCHOOLS" FOR PAUPER CHILDREN.

A Speech by SAMUEL SMITH, ESQ., M.P., *in the House of Commons, June 2, 1899.*

I WISH to specially remind the Committee that the Poor Law Schools Committee issued what is a most important report on the extremely unwholesome character of the barrack school system. My object in bringing the matter before the Committee to-night is to spur on the Local Government Board and to spur on the Boards of Guardians to carry out the broader policy of the recommendations of the Committee. That Committee was presided over by Mr. Mundella, and contained a number of well-known gentlemen, and altogether was a very strong and competent Committee to deal with the question of pauper children. I will ask now permission to lay before the Committee a few facts with regard to this matter. The Committee was limited to the Metropolitan Schools, containing some 17,000 pauper children, but I believe it may be taken as substantially representing all the pauper schools of the country. The condition is worse in London, because the schools are larger, but the vices of this system of training are apparent everywhere. The conclusion they came to was that the system was an exceedingly expensive one, and an extremely unwholesome one; that herding vast numbers of children together in large institutions has a deadly effect on health and character; and that it produces worse results than when children are brought up even in the poorest homes. They then give a number of recommendations for the suppression of this system altogether. It was shown that the average cost for 17,000 pauper children was £29 5*s.* 6*d.* per head, or 11*s.* per child a week; that is to say, the cost of bringing up a pauper child is nearly half the income of an average working-class family containing six or seven persons. At the Hanwell school the cost per child ran up to £42 15*s.* 2*d.* The cost of building that enormous institution was £177,000. This, in any case, is wasteful expense in the highest degree. But this would not matter so much if the system were not such a bad one. I do not think there is a philanthropist living but who would agree that to herd 1,000 or 1,500 children together in one institution is anything but favourable to the health of these children. The rate of mortality is higher than that

of the poorest districts in the metropolis. Infectious diseases are never absent from these institutions. Ophthalmia is a constant scourge; there are times when as many as twenty per cent. of the children are ill at a time; in some of the schools all the children have been visited with this plague at one time or another, and great numbers of them have their eyes weakened for life; they go out into the world heavily handicapped from this cause alone. The report of a medical officer shows that you cannot have a number of children herded together without mischief of this kind occurring. He says:—

In the schools as conducted at present, with the exception of Hanwell, every child loses its education directly it gets ophthalmia. The attack often lasts for months in greater or less severity, during the whole of which time the child ceases to have any mental training or to be subjected to the school discipline. Although in some cases the time that active eye mischief is present is comparatively short, the eye may remain unhealthy, or in a state that necessitates isolation during many months. Throughout this period the children must spend their days in the room or airing yard of the isolation ward. They have for companions only other children afflicted in the same way; they are cut off from their friends, from their games in the field, from their walks in the country, from their work in the school or in the shop; if able to read they have no opportunity, and they are not ill enough to interest others. Thus in the milder cases the restrictions necessary for preventing the spread of the malady constitute a much greater immediate evil for the affected children than does the disease itself.

But this is not the only disease prevalent in these schools; ringworm and skin diseases are also very common, and the average health of the children is very low indeed. This seems to be a terrible condition of things, and although everybody knows that it is substantially true, still the system is going on in the main, and only very slowly are changes being made. The Report on the Education of the children is also very unsatisfactory; the standard attained is much below that of ordinary elementary schools. The inspection is not by the ordinary class of inspectors subject to the requirements of the Code, but by a special class under the Local Government Board. The Report of the Committee states:—

The information we have obtained, confirmed as it has been by our personal observation and examination, has convinced us that in many of these particulars, the Poor Law Schools of the Metropolis are far below the standard usually attained, age for age, by the children in public elementary schools.

The schools are not under the Education Department, but under the Local Government Board. But worst of all in my opinion is the demoralizing effect on character, especially in the case of girls, of the life of the schools. There is only one opinion among all the witnesses as to the deadening effect of this herding of masses of children without love or affection. I should like to quote two or three proofs of this. Miss Whitworth has acted for several years as Secretary for that admirable Society, the Metropolitan Association Befriending Young Servants. She gives a list of these faults:—

Rudeness, sullenness, violence, destructiveness, carelessness, idleness, obstinacy, and a curious ignorance of common things.

This witness also alludes to another trait in the character of the girls. They are unable, she says, to face any difficulty, and they are in despair at a small trouble.

A girl only thinks she would "like to be dead," or to commit suicide or something, when she gets into a minor trouble or difficulty. Perhaps she is put upstairs for a half-day, and she says she will never do anything again as long as she lives, and will never be seen alive again; that kind of thing is very common; the inability to face difficulty comes from never having had any difficulties to face; a girl in school has so few difficulties, she does not know what it is to have survived them, and she thinks she cannot survive them.

38. This failing is attributed by the witness to the fact that the children have everything done for them at the school, and that they necessarily lead a mechanical and routine life. The following is the testimony of a lady who has worked for twelve years amongst workhouse girls :—

In district school girls, with scarcely an exception, I have found very strongly marked what I think is a great characteristic of the girls brought up in such large schools—intense obstinacy and sullenness. . . . I do not remember a single instance of exactly the same kind of temper among the other girls, the greater number of whom come from very poor homes; their fathers dock labourers, and large families living in one or two rooms. I do feel most strongly that family life, even among the very poor, has an entirely different effect on the character of a child from life in a large school.

Dr. Barnardo is also a gentleman who has had vast experience of this subject. He has 6,000 children under his care, and he has passed through his hands altogether some 30,000 children. His evidence before the Commission is of immense value. With regard to the girls he says :—

The mental condition of the girls has been a source of great amazement to me, their dulness and incapacity, and especially the animalism of their tempers. I have had some of these cases which have been the most perplexing I have ever had in all my experience, and I have been compelled to reject most of these girls as unfitted for emigration. I do so with great regret, but there was no hope of my being able eventually to emigrate them. I do not know whether a topic of this sort may be usefully introduced here; but I am bound to say that evil habits are much more prevalent than, I think, the public have any conception of in all Poor Law establishments of a barrack class in which girls are aggregated.

Now, I particularly ask the Committee to listen to this sentence :—

Very few girls come from Poor Law institutions who have not, apparently, been more or less contaminated. When these children were sent down to our village home, or to our other homes, the facts crept out in a few days in their own communications with other girls in the cottage. Our small cottages gave us so much more opportunity of finding the evil out much more quickly than would have otherwise been the case.

I do not think that any one will deny that there is too much truth

in those statements, but although this Report was issued five or six years ago, this scandalous condition of things is still going on in at least several of these large schools.

Mr. Chaplin: No, no; it is not.

Mr. Samuel Smith: I believe there has been one important change. There is the Sutton school, containing 1,500 children, and I believe a scheme is now in progress for dispersing that great mass of children. But the bulk of the schools in England, which contain 52,000 children, are mostly in the condition that they were five years ago. How long are we going to wait before we alter it? The way in which Guardians are wedded to this system has sometimes made me think that there must be some persons interested in these large establishments where such numbers of children are herded together because of the difficulty there is to change their policy. I noticed the other day a scheme for building large numbers of cottage homes at Liverpool, but they are to be built in villages, and the cost for each child would come to £200. For that you could build a first-class workman's house. The Guardians will not move unless we can move public opinion through this House, and the chief reason that I raise the question here to-night is in order to let the public know what is being done. Now, what I propose to do is to suggest that some of the recommendations of the Committee which reported five years ago should be carried out. The principal recommendation of the Committee was to board out the children in respectable working-class homes, as is done in nearly every country but this; which is done in Scotland with such excellent results, where the bulk of pauper children disappear, because they are brought up with other children, and so lose their pauper taint. The total number of children boarded out now in this country is but 2,000 out of the 52,000, in addition to which there are 4,000 boarded out within the various unions. Another recommendation is that these children should be separated from the pauper class as much as possible. They should be brought up in a healthy home after God's ordinance, which is the only true way to bring them up. One of the rules of the Local Government Board is that no child can be boarded out at a greater cost than 4*s*. a week. In the pauper school they cost 11*s*. a week, but to be boarded out they must not cost more than 4*s*. Just consider what an absurd limit that is. Is it not better to board them out for 5*s*. or 6*s*. or 7*s*. per week rather than keep them in these barrack schools at a cost of 11*s*. per week? I have one quotation which I would like to give to the House as to the advantage of home training:—

> One advantage to the child of boarding out is that it provides home training and allows development of personal affections. Of course the home training is what has made our English working classes as good as they are. Home training involves a great many things which perhaps men know less of than women; it is the small details of everyday home life that bring out the character of a child, and that, as it grows up, enable it, though unconsciously, to develop self-dependence, resourcefulness, thriftiness; it learns by the example of its elders. This is a perfectly unconscious influence, and no amount of teaching by direct information could give a child

that particular class of experience which it gets in the everyday home life—the rubs and frictions that come from brothers and sisters and elders and youngsters; the self-denial that it sees its parents going through when times are bad, the happiness when times are better; the need of forethought; the dependence for success on industrious habits; the value of money and clothes—from all these the boarded-out child learns and realizes what the life that is coming to it will be. Then there is another thing; home life draws out the personal affections, and I think it is one of the most terrible things in workhouses or in very large schools that a child who can elsewhere be trained, up to a certain age, through its affections has that particular item in its human character perfectly undeveloped, and I believe that is the reason that so many of them in after life fall. I am not speaking against the officers of the schools. I think they do good work as far as they can, but it is a sheer impossibility that they can do what can only be done in the ordinary everyday home.

Then another point is that they are educated in a family of mixed ages and both sexes, which is most important. Of course, it is impossible in a large school or in a large workhouse to allow the boys and girls to mix together, and they never see each other from one year's end to another. This is a serious drawback in after life, especially with girls; they have not been accustomed to receive the respect which a boy ought to give a girl in his own cottage home, they do not know how to treat boys, they have never seen them; consequently they do not know how to treat young men, nor do the young men know how to treat the girls when they meet them.

Next to the system of boarding out I would put Cottage Homes. By Cottage Homes I do not mean a large village of twenty or thirty houses which results in many hundreds of children being brought together, but the Cottage Homes like those of the Sheffield Union, where twenty or thirty children are put under the care of a kind motherly house-mother, and the children attend the public schools of the place, and live as natural a life as possible. I desire to separate the children from everything which maintains the pauper taint. The last thing I wish to call the attention of the Committee to is a method of which I have myself had great experience, and that is emigration, and I say of all the means at our disposal it is the best way of disposing of pauper or deserted children.

I have had long experience of this system, and have been a party to the emigration of 3,000 or 4,000 poor children from Liverpool to Canada. These were not Poor Law children, but rather waifs and strays and equally destitute; but they had not the name of pauper children, which is such a brand of inferiority in Canada. These children get on far better in Canada than is possible in this old and crowded country. We easily find them homes in the houses of yeoman farmers, where they live with the family, and are often adopted, and the vast majority do well in after life. One great advantage is that they are entirely cut off from their degraded relatives in this country, who frequently get hold of the pauper children when they come out of the schools and drag them back to vice and misery. There is no such thorough way of dealing with children in this country as emigration. Here we have an overplus of children, and every channel is choked up, and in Canada there is a large open field; but instead of seeing this method increase it is steadily diminishing. At one time the Boards

of Guardians in England used to emigrate nearly 400 children a year, and last year it was only 78. No doubt there are difficulties in the way, little trifling expenses of £1 here and £1 there which the Guardians cannot see their way to pay; but in reality it is a great economy. You give these children a six months' training, you pay about £10 a head for outfit and passage money to Canada; the whole thing can be done for £15, or £20 at the outside, including cost of inspection, instead of perhaps £200 for a term of years in a pauper school. Looking at it from an economic point of view there does seem to be an enormous saving in treating the children in this way, and I cannot understand the reluctance to adopt it in this country. When I blame the Guardians they say it is the fault of the Local Government Board, and when I speak to the Local Government Board upon the subject they lay the blame upon the Boards of Guardians. In Canada we have 5,000,000 of people with unlimited territory, whilst in London we have 6,000,000 of people and multitudes of children, and yet little is done by the Guardians to make use of this grand channel for the disposition of our pauper children. A great portion of these workhouse children are children of parents who have contracted the taste for drink, which they have transmitted to their descendants, and in their surroundings in this country they will likely become drunkards. But we have emigrated thousands of destitute children to Canada who have grown up to manhood and womanhood free from temptation, and have remained total abstainers. Surely when the House is aware of the enormous advantages of this system they ought to bring pressure to bear on the Local Government Board and the Boards of Guardians to look better after these poor children. It is very trying to observe also how reforms of this kind are so slow of being adopted in England. I believe we require stronger legislation to bring power to bear on backward Boards of Guardians, and also to stop vicious parents taking their children from school and tramping about the country with them, because the children in the process acquire vicious habits and are continually thrown upon the rates. They deal far more summarily in America with these vicious parents. The children are by law taken out of the hands of disreputable parents and put under the control of trustees up to the age of eighteen and sometimes twenty-one, and so saved from continuing the vicious lives to which their parents are condemning them. We require something of the same kind in this country, but we are so dreadfully jealous of the rights of parents that we have hitherto refused to interfere with their control over their unhappy offspring. I hope that one result of this debate will be that something will be done by the Local Government Board in regard to the treatment of pauper children more encouraging than in the past.

Appendix VI

Speech by SAMUEL SMITH, M.P., *delivered at Hengler's Circus, December* 5, 1882

THE first feeling of my mind is one of gratitude to this great and influential assembly for the extreme cordiality with which they have received an untried man. I desire to return my thanks to this great audience, and to the whole Liberal Party of Liverpool, for the great enthusiasm, the great kindness with which they have received my candidature. I was a comparative stranger to you all until a period of about ten days ago, and nothing has surprised me more than the extraordinary kindness with which the town at large has received my name. I desire to return my thanks to all the many friends who have written and spoken such kind things regarding me. I feel that they have said a great deal more than my merits deserve, and I wish to take this, the first opportunity that I have had of meeting the great Liberal party in its thousands, to say how much I feel the kindness and consideration which has been extended to me. Now, on this my first meeting face to face with the great mass of the electors, there are two courses open to me. I might either mainly confine my remarks to criticisms upon the orations which were made from this place last night, or I might rather take the opportunity of defining more exactly the position which I hold in regard to Liberalism. Now, I think it will be more agreeable to you, as many of you are for the first time hearing me as a new and untried man, that I should mainly direct my remarks to defining more exactly the principles of Liberalism which I hold. I have gone upon the principle from the beginning of my canvass of taking the constituency, if I may use the expression, into my confidence. I have made a frank, ingenuous statement of all my views. I have not sought to hide anything, or leave any of my opinions in obscurity. I wish, before the polling day, that the whole town of Liverpool may know exactly what is at the bottom of my heart, so that they may be able to decide, with full and competent knowledge, respecting the man who is now before you.

I wish to say, in the first place, that I am a loyal and devoted subject of Her Majesty Queen Victoria. There is no one in the town of Liverpool, be he Conservative or Liberal, to whom I would yield in respect and affection for our great and glorious British Constitution. I can take up and echo much of the language which was used from

this platform last night, and it is a pleasant thing to think that my area of belief covers so much common ground with that of the Conservative Party. It was said last night that some of the present advisers of Her Majesty are Republicans. I don't know whether this be true or not, but I think it was a very wide shot. I think it has gone considerably past the mark; but whatever any one else may be, secretly or avowedly, I am here to say that I am thoroughly satisfied with the Constitution under which we live. I have no objection to Republicanism in Republican countries. I believe in America a Republic is the best form of Government possible. I believe also in Switzerland it is the best form of Government possible; but I am here to say to-night that I believe our mixed and well-balanced Constitution is the best form of Government, and the most suitable, for this ancient country.

I wish further to say that I believe with some of the speakers last night, that religion lies at the basis of the social edifice. I believe that no durable structure of Government can be built up in this or any other country except on the basis of our common Christianity. I believe that the principles of Christianity ought to penetrate and inform all the legislation of our country. I will venture to say that I think we might define true Liberalism to be an expansion of the golden rule, that rule which tells us to do to others as we would they should do unto us. I believe that the business of a true statesman is to interpret that rule with reference to all the exigencies of life, and I believe that just in proportion as our legislation is built upon the great principles of righteousness, justice and truth, just in that proportion will the country flourish, and its prosperity remain unimpaired.

Something was said here last night about Religious Education. Well, I am also here to avow my belief in the great importance to the country of religious education for the young—to state that I admire that great Education Act, the honour of which mainly belongs to William Edward Forster, and which has so wisely joined together the old educational agencies of England, and added to them those new and necessary agencies which our advancing civilization required. I accepted the Education Act of Mr. Forster and the Liberal Government with great satisfaction. It seems to me to combine in itself all the elements of a wise and just compromise between rival systems; and in this respect I will stand here on my own footing and say I differed at the time when that Act was passed from certain of my own party, and I think the experience of the last twelve years has proved that Mr. Forster was right, and what was called at that time the Birmingham school was wrong. I do not wish at present to argue the question. Good and able men take opposite sides; but as I have entered upon this canvass as an independent politician it is my part to define the place I take in the ranks of the Liberal P

The Liberal Party of England may be said to have grown i present great power with two great names in its front rank. two great names are Richard Cobden and John Bright. I

specially given to that great and pure-minded man, Richard Cobden, to expound the laws of political economy in relation to the wants of a country such as this ; and I think we can never repay the debt of gratitude which we owe to Richard Cobden for opening the eyes of the British nation to the impolicy of protection, and for opening our ports to the trade of the world. Now, I wish to say that in the realm of political economy I am a disciple of Richard Cobden ; but I also want to draw a distinction, and I wish to say that, looking back upon the career of that great man at this distance of time, it is permitted to us to remark that his views were somewhat one-sided ; and I want now to try to bring out wherein I venture to differ in some degree from the Liberalism identified with Richard Cobden. Richard Cobden, and the Party to which he belonged, were so deeply impressed with the evil of Government interference with trade, that the great object of their lives seemed to be to minimise to the utmost the interference of the Government with the life of the people. He devoted his life to removing those restrictions upon trade and commerce which previous ages had fastened upon it ; but I think Richard Cobden scarcely realized to the full the responsibility of Government for social Reform. I must admit that there was a certain weakness on that side of his character, a weakness shared by the whole of the Liberal Party of that time. No doubt many of you here present are aware that Richard Cobden, and what was called the Manchester school of politicians, were opposed to those most wise and beneficial Factory Acts which Lord Shaftesbury was privileged to introduce. The school of Liberalism of that day was so dominated by the idea of freedom of trade that it did not sufficiently allow for the danger of the weak and oppressed portions of society being trodden down by the strong and more powerful. Now, I desire to say that I think the England of to-day owes just as much to the philanthropy of Lord Shaftesbury as it does to the economical wisdom of Cobden and Bright. I entirely approve of that career of social legislation which began with the Factory Acts forty years ago, which limited the hours of labour of women and children in mines and factories, and delivered them from a state of degradation of which the present age could scarcely conceive. I may remind you there was a time when women and children had to work all hours of the day and many of the night, dragging trucks in coal mines, almost in a state of nudity, and it was then considered that the principles of free trade and free contract were so inviolable that those abuses could not be interfered with by law. I differ from that school of economy, and I entirely agree with the great school of refort mation to which Lord Shaftesbury belonged, which has greatly alleviated the condition of the oppressed classes of our community, and marvellously sweetened and purified the social life of England.

It is my belief that all densely-peopled countries like ours, where the struggle of life is very great, where competition is very strong, require a great deal of Social Legislation. Were it not for that the weak and the helpless part of Society would be trodden down in the hot competition of life ; and I am amongst those who believe that the

Liberalism of to-day must embrace two distinct elements. It must embrace the clear economic views associated with the names of Cobden and Bright, and it must also carry out in its fulness the Christian philanthropy of Lord Shaftesbury. I am not amongst those who believe that there is any such thing as finality in politics. I believe that each age brings to light new wants and new necessities, and the business of Government is patiently and wisely to adapt itself to the needs of each age; and though it is true that the last forty years have wrought a wondrous change in the social life of England, in the way of sweetening the elements of human society, I believe there is yet much more work to be done. We still have in England far too many of what I may call the down-trodden classes—down-trodden no doubt, very much by their own vices and their own weaknesses, too much the slaves of circumstances which they themselves have brought about—but still, I say, considering the high position which we hold in the world, considering our enlightenment, our liberty and our wealth, we ought not, at this time of the day, to have these great masses of helpless, degraded creatures, which form so miserable a spectacle in all our great towns.

The principles I have already laid down would involve the recognition of the fact that Government must, in some shape or another, deal with this mass of ignorant, intemperate, and vicious people, with a view to their improvement. It is this view which leads me to believe that we want in this country a great system of Licensing reform. It is this principle which makes me feel the necessity of some measure in the direction of what is called Local Option and Sunday Closing, and I am very glad to see that my opponent here last night has at last come out with a profession of faith—rather tardily, but somewhat in the same direction. I may be forgiven for saying that he has come out with it rather tardily. Some of us, who have been labouring for twenty years in the same direction, may, perhaps, take credit for having educated the Conservative Party into these principles. But while I must admit with sorrow the large amount of intemperance and degradation we have in our midst, I must take this opportunity of altogether repudiating a statement put into my mouth last night, if I read the report in the newspapers correctly, where I was held to state that the great mass of our population was intemperate. I never said anything of the kind. I do not believe anything of the kind. I believe much the larger part of the British population is now a temperate people. Temperance has made wonderful progress in the ranks of all classes of society, and though drunkenness and intemperance still exist, it is among a small minority compared with the whole population.

Among the social reforms I have alluded to I specially class Sanitary Questions. The present age is one of sanitary reform. On all sides our eyes are being opened to the misery caused by bad sanitary laws, by unhealthy dwellings, by bad drainage, and by those other causes which make the death rate of Liverpool the highest of the great cities of England, and in some parts of our town double what it ought to

be. I believe there will be a great advancement of sanitary science in the future, and that a great addition will be thus made to the happiness and longevity of the human race.

And, in connexion with that, I will also make a correction regarding a remark made by Mr. Forwood last night. As some of you are perhaps aware, I took a great interest in the opening out of what is called Nash Grove. I did my best to get that piece of ground kept as an open space for the benefit of the densely-packed population of Liverpool. I was charged last night by my opponent with having for two years opposed the erection of workmen's dwellings upon Nash Grove. What I really did was this. I opposed the covering over of Nash Grove with streets of new houses, but advocated keeping the open space as a recreation ground, and building round it a fringe of workmen's houses. And I will state another fact which I should never have done in my life had I not been charged in this manner last night. When I was in Scotland last year, after vainly endeavouring to keep this ground open, I received a letter from a generous benefactor of this town, Mr. Cliff, urging me to go on in my efforts to secure that land for the town, and offering himself to contribute £1,000 to help in laying out and beautifying that space of ground. I wrote thanking Mr. Cliff, acknowledging the generous offer, and stating that I would be most willing to duplicate it, and I asked him to lay the matter before the chairman of the Health Committee, and say that he and I would undertake to lay out the ground as a place of recreation, and to do all the work ourselves, on condition that the Health Committee would build workmen's houses round the outer circle, and keep the centre open. As I was absent from town, I cannot exactly tell you what steps were taken, but for some reason or another the Health Committee did not feel itself able to change the plans already agreed upon. However, I wish to say that so far from my being opposed to the erection of healthy workmen's dwellings, I have been a great supporter of them, and I will go as far in that line as Mr. Forwood, and indeed, I think, probably a little further.

I sometimes think of the British nation, with its teeming industries and its busy national life, in the light of a huge engine driving on remorselessly, and throwing off a great quantity of refuse on the way. That refuse is composed of helpless human beings—and I say it is the part of the Government in a country such as ours, where competition is so fierce and the strain of human life is so great, to take care of these weak and helpless creatures, so far as may be without pauperizing them or degrading them, and to throw around them the shield and the fence of wise and beneficent laws.

I have spoken so far chiefly on social questions; but I want now to glance for a moment at what may be called Imperial questions. This little island is the centre of one of the greatest empires the world ever saw. I wish to say I am proud of the British Empire, and I have no sympathy with that extreme wing of our party—a wing, I believe, of no value or national importance whatever—who wish to throw off the Colonies, and break up this great empire. England is the

heart of an immense empire, and its soundness and healthiness depend upon the heart being in a healthy state. It is my deep conviction that England can only hold this vast empire in proportion as she is true to those principles of righteousness, justice, and truth which lie at the basis of Christianity. I believe in so far as we have been more favoured than other nations of Europe, it is because we have tried to carry out more honestly the principles of the Christian religion. I believe if those principles were to decay the power of this empire would rapidly decline. I have no belief that we possess any physical or material power sufficient to hold down by brute force three hundred millions of people. I believe it is the moral force of this country which governs this great empire; and therefore I think it is a matter of the highest importance, even looking at it from a utilitarian point of view, that we should keep alive in this country an active and healthy Christian faith. When I look back on many great empires which have existed in former days, I find that they all had a period of rise, greatness, and decline; and the period of decline was always coincident with a period of moral corruption. It was when Rome became corrupt that her great empire broke to pieces; and I believe that whenever England becomes corrupt her great empire will break to pieces too. Now, I am a supporter of the Government presided over by our noble Premier, because he embodies those moral principles which are the life-blood of this empire. I support Mr. Gladstone because we have never had a statesman who has raised so high the national conscience; who has dealt with all questions so much upon the high plane of moral righteousness. My opponent, last night, called Mr. Gladstone a despot. When I read, this morning, that statement in the newspapers, those lines of Byron flashed across my mind where he describes the hero of Marathon :—

> The tyrant of the Chersonese
> Was Freedom's best and bravest friend;
> That tyrant was Miltiades.
> Oh! that the present hour would lend
> Another despot of the kind—
> Such chains as his were sure to bind.

Again, I ask the cause of the *so-called despotism* which Mr. Gladstone exerts over the rank and file of the Liberal Party. I reply that I find it in his peerless excellence; I find it in his marvellous, almost incredible, intellectual power; I find it in the noble principles of his heart and conscience; I find such a combination in Mr. Gladstone as has never been seen in any English statesman in our day, or in the days of our fathers. The sway which Mr. Gladstone exercises at the present hour is the natural healthy normal result of a whole life spent in the service of mankind. Mr. Forwood will call this political idolatry. I venture to say that it is no breach of the second commandment. I am not one of those who would yield blind obedience, even to Mr. Gladstone, if my judgment were not convinced; but I follow him because he has in the main convinced my judgment, as well as

laid strong hold on my conscientious convictions of truth. A large part of the speech of my opponent last night was devoted to what I call nibbling criticism of the action of our great statesman, first towards Ireland, and then towards Egypt. According to that gentleman, Mr. Gladstone's Government was the cause of all the murders and outrages which have taken place in Ireland. I picture to myself the two rival policies of the Conservatives and Liberals towards Ireland very much in this light. The policy of the Conservatives is to sit upon the boiler, and quietly wait until it bursts. The Conservatives keep the steam pent up within, and then they call it peace. The Liberal Government, under its great leader, opens the safety valve to let off the superfluous steam, and because it makes a great deal of hissing and spluttering they say the Liberal Government have turned Ireland upside down. Again, I picture to myself the rival policies towards Ireland under guise of a physician and his patient. The surgeon, Gladstone, takes his lance, probes the wound, and lets out a quantity of purulent matter which produces a disagreeable smell. The Conservatives say that Mr. Gladstone is making Ireland so foul that it is impossible to live there. Their policy, on the other hand, is to apply an ointment which forms a skin over the wound, drives the disease within, and then leave the patient to die. It is always a disagreeable thing to apply a remedy to a disease. There are unpleasant incidents that happen during the treatment of a patient by his physician. These incidents have happened in Ireland during the last few years, because I believe Mr. Gladstone has been drawing out the poison from the system; he has been laying the foundation of a new social order which I believe future generations will ascribe to his wise statesmanship, and will point back to the time when those solid foundations were laid upon which a new Ireland would rise up and call him blessed. The Conservatives say Mr. Gladstone has destroyed the peace of Ireland by taking the property of the landowners and throwing it as a sop to men whom they describe as little better than rebels! I say that Mr. Gladstone has put a limit upon the power of the landlords to confiscate the improvements of the tenants. I say that Mr. Gladstone has given to the three southern provinces of Ireland—the Catholic provinces—the same rights which Ulster, the Protestant province, has had for two hundred years. He has conceded to the whole tenantry of Ireland that tenant-right which they had always demanded, and believed to be their own—that tenant-right which the Protestant farmers of the north had extorted by their determination ages ago, but which the weaker inhabitants of the south were not able to exact. Mr. Gladstone has put the whole island upon the same footing of equal justice. He has made no distinction between the Protestant of the north and the Catholic of the south, and I believe the time will come when the Catholics of the south will heartily recognize this, and look back on Mr. Gladstone as one of their greatest and noblest benefactors. I venture to predict that the time will come when the mass of the Irish people will be ashamed of the way in which some of them now talk

of the greatest of their benefactors — the time will come when I hope the Irish people as a body will put an end to those incendiaries whose business is to sow strife and dissension, and stir up class against class, and people against people. The English people wish to live in peace and friendship with the Irish people. There is no desire nearer and dearer to my heart than this. And I hope that before Mr. Gladstone leaves this world for a better he will be able to see a great decline in Irish disaffection, and, as a reward of his generous statesmanship, some approach towards that happier future which I am persuaded will come in the ages that are to follow.

There was a great deal said last night about the faults and shortcomings of our Egyptian policy. I have scarcely the patience to wade through nibbling remarks made about matters of past history, matters about which the nation now feels no concern, such as whether the British admiral should have landed 300 marines at a certain hour of the day or not, and whether Mr. Gladstone should have sent orders to bombard Alexandria one or two days prior to the time it was bombarded. These are matters of small importance. The nation at large is too well satisfied with the fruits of that expedition, and with the solid position in which our interest in Egypt now stands, to care about such trifling matters as our friends animadverted on last night. But I will leave to other speakers to supplement these brief observations upon the Egyptian expedition, and I will draw my remarks to a close by saying that I believe in Mr. Gladstone because he follows the path of steady and peaceful reform. I believe in the Liberal Government because their object is to make the British people more loyal and contented, to bind class firmly together with class, and to make the British people more happy and prosperous than ever they have been before; and I believe that already the England of Queen Victoria has reached a point of contentment which has never been seen in past ages, and that contentment is in no small degree owing to the deeds of the Government over which Mr. Gladstone presides. I believe in the Government of Mr. Gladstone because it seeks to realize that noble description of England given by our poet Laureate—

> A land of settled Government;
> A land of just and old renown,
> Where freedom slowly broadens down
> From precedent to precedent.

That is the England that I love, that is the style of progress that I admire, that is the type of Liberalism that commends itself to my judgment; and I have done my best to-night to set before you what I think ought to be the features of modern Liberalism, and I hope and trust the description I have given appeals to your highest judgment and intelligence, and that the effect will be seen next Friday in the poll of a majority of this great constituency.

Appendix VII

Speech on Seconding the Address, 1884

MR. SAMUEL SMITH : In rising to second the Address, I desire to express my deep sense of the honour done to the great constituency which I am privileged to represent, in being asked to perform this duty. I congratulate the House upon the general tranquillity which prevails throughout the world, and the excellent relations which this country continues to maintain with all the great Powers of Europe. This freedom from foreign complications offers a golden opportunity for much-needed domestic legislation, and I trust that Parliament will take full advantage of it, and support Her Majesty's Government in the valuable reforms of which notice has been given to-day.

The House will be glad to learn that the revenue is likely to fulfil the expectations of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and that, too, notwithstanding that trade continues dull and profits small in all the great industries of the nation. Unfortunately, the elasticity of British trade has suffered considerable abatement for several years past ; but it is satisfactory to think that the mass of the labouring population is pretty well employed and fairly well off, owing to the cheapness and abundance of food. I have to thank the Government, on behalf of the commercial classes, for their vigilant attention to the interests of trade—they are negotiating treaties with Spain, Turkey, Japan and the Corea. Of these treaties, some are in a more advanced stage than others, and I would especially commend their action with respect to Spain, for we have suffered for a long time from the almost prohibitory tariff of that country, and I trust that success will crown their efforts.

With regard to Ireland, I rejoice that there has been a marked diminution of crime and increased prosperity over a considerable portion of that country. It is, however, deeply to be regretted that in the province of Ulster there has been a revival of old and half-forgotten feuds ; but it is to be hoped that the Government will firmly use the powers entrusted to them, in order to prevent further collisions and effusions of blood in that province, as well as in other parts of the sister island. Nevertheless, one cannot help feeling that, after all, something more is wanting than mere physical force to keep the peace in Ireland. There needs to be diffused a far deeper sense of the evil wrought by bitter words, and of the moral responsibility which rests upon all those who are in a position to guide public opinion to see that their language tends to promote peace on earth and good-will amongst men. I feel sure that no deeper desire animates our great leader than

to wipe out, as far as may be, the sad memories of a melancholy past, and I am sure that I interpret the feelings of the House when I say that we wish to be spared the painful necessity of having exceptional legislation in one of the three kingdoms. I appeal, therefore, to those who influence the opinion and feelings of the Irish people, to make it easy to return to constitutional government, and to meet us half-way in the attempt to do equal justice to every section of the inhabitants of the British Isles.

A population almost as large as that of Ireland is looking forward with eager interest to the promised London Reform Bill. It has often been felt to be an anomaly that the metropolis alone of all the cities and towns in the country should be deprived of local self-government. It has suffered intensely from conflicting jurisdictions and feeble administration, and the time has fully come when an end must be put to the state of chaos which now prevails. Next to the Franchise Bill, which my hon. friend the Member for Roxburghshire (Mr. A. Elliot) so ably dealt with, and which, therefore, calls for no comment from me, no measure excites more public interest; and that interest has been greatly deepened since the bitter cry of "Outcast London" has sounded in our ears. The nation has at last awakened to the fact that a hideous mass of human misery lies at the base of our social fabric. The wealthiest capital in the world has also the deepest abyss of squalid poverty. We intend that these evils shall be dealt with, as far as may be, by right legislation; but it is rather the duty of local than Imperial bodies to grapple with such questions as the housing of the poor, the enforcement of moral and sanitary regulations, and the provision of open spaces, public baths, and facilities for healthy recreation. We look, therefore, with hope to the creation of a great municipal body in London, which will distinguish itself by attacking social abuses of every kind, and make this city one that the poor as well as the rich may be proud to live in.

I rejoice that the great cause of temperance has received the attention of Her Majesty's Government, and that they intend to deal with it on the principle of giving control over the liquor trade to the ratepayers. I trust that the provisions of the various Bills relating to local government will contain such powers as will satisfy the great army of temperance reformers. I do not speak of extremists, but of those who mourn over the excessive intemperance of the masses of our fellow countrymen, for they know only too well that our squalid poverty is mainly the result of this national vice. I venture to go a step further, and say that nothing will satisfy the deep feeling of the nation except such measures as will largely diminish the temptations to drunkenness, and such as will, in some measure, protect those poor besotted victims who cannot protect themselves. We have given far too great facilities to this dangerous trade in the past, and we are reaping the harvest in an hereditary pauper class which poisons our national life and remains untouched by all the amenities of civilization. The time has come to grapple with this plague; the conscience of the nation is alive to the sin and the danger of spending nearly £130,000,000

annually upon strong drink, and the Government will receive the support of all right-thinking men in devising machinery that will cope in some adequate degree with this terrible evil.

I pass now to a measure that excites great interest amongst the large sea-faring and shipowning classes of the country. The lamentable loss of life at sea is a painful drawback to that great trade which gives us our maritime supremacy among the nations of the world. Many honest attempts have been made of late years to reduce these casualties. The name of Mr. Plimsoll will always be held in honour as the champion of the British sailor. Partly as the result of his agitation the Board of Trade has assumed very extensive functions of control and surveillance of late years. Yet it must be admitted that the results have belied the expectations formed. The frightful tale of human misery goes on almost unchecked, and the conviction has been formed that we must act on different lines. My right hon. friend, the indefatigable President of the Board of Trade, is prepared to show a more excellent way. He will lay before the House a Bill, the object of which is to increase the sense of responsibility on the part of shipowners to make it the interest of all, as it is already their duty, to keep their ships in a seaworthy state, and to disconnect the hope of profit from the loss of a ship. It is, I feel sure, in no spirit of unfairness to an honourable calling that the Bill is introduced. It is cheerfully conceded that the great body of British shipowners are an honour to their country, but it cannot be concealed that there are some exceptions to the rule, and the law will be altered so as to be a check on evil-doers, while not interfering with those who do well. No doubt, this difficult question will be dealt with as successfully in a Grand Committee as the Bankruptcy Bill was last Session.

That most useful body, the Railway Commission, will have its powers extended, and the control which the State most wisely maintains over our great railway system will be strengthened. Few subjects interest our commercial classes more than just and uniform rates of carriage, and these can only be assured by a powerful central jurisdiction.

The country will also be glad to learn that the repression of corrupt practices at elections is not to be confined to national politics, but is to be extended to municipal elections as well ; and we must hope that the effect will be to purify that important fountain of our nation's well-being.

I rejoice that the Government intend to meet the strong temperance sentiment of Ireland by introducing a Bill to complete the system of Sunday closing of public-houses. We shall then have three out of four portions of the United Kingdom privileged to have one day in the week free from these temptations to intemperance. Is it too much to express the hope that the remaining portion will demand its inclusion within the scope of this beneficent law, and strengthen the hands of the Government to complete the sacred chain that guards the Day of Rest ?

As representing a large body of Welsh constituents, I am glad that

the claims of the Principality to higher education continue to engage the attention of the Government. Nothing is more creditable to Wales than its eager desire to perfect its educational system. The efforts of the poorer people are beyond all praise, and any aid the National Exchequer can give will be well spent among that peaceful, industrious, and religious people.

I may add, in conclusion, that the country expects much from the devolution of Parliamentary work on the Grand Committees, and hopes for a term of beneficent legislation unhindered by obstruction or vexatious Party strife. This Parliament has large arrears of business to overtake; a full tale of work has been set before it to-day. Therefore let us hope that this work will be done so as to deserve the gratitude of the nation we represent and the Empire we govern.

Appendix VIII

FALLACIES OF SOCIALISM EXPOSED

Being a Reply to the Manifesto of the Democratic Federation, by SAMUEL SMITH, M.P.

SAMUEL SMITH TO H. M. HYNDMAN, CHAIRMAN DEMOCRATIC FEDERATION

Letter No. 1

I HAVE received your note of the 28th instant, enclosing a Manifesto of what you style "The Democratic Federation," and saying that, as I call myself "a Socialist,"[1] it may interest me. I beg to say that my views of "Socialism," so far as the term "Socialist" can justly be applied to me, are widely different from yours; they are based upon Christian morality, one of the first principles of which is obedience to God's commandments, and the eighth of those commandments is "Thou shalt not steal."

Now the programme you send me advocates the confiscation of nearly all the property in the country, including the savings of multitudes of hard-working honest people, and the sole means of livelihood of thousands of widows and orphans. I see no distinction between this wholesale robbery and the act of a thief or highwayman, who robs an honest traveller, except that the crime you advocate is gigantic, and that the sufferers would be millions.

Christianity teaches us to love our neighbours as ourselves, and to do unto others as we would be done by.

Your programme is full of bitter denunciation of all classes in the community who do not live by hand labour, and seeks to stir up the worst feelings of human nature. Your scheme could only be carried out by a murderous civil war, in which oceans of blood would be spilt and our country reduced to a desert. All the wealth of which you speak would perish, and nothing would remain but the bare soil of the country, which would not maintain half the population; and those who did survive would be reduced almost to the condition of savages. You seem to think that social perfection can only be reached by destroying all the classes of society, who by industry, frugality and intelligence, have raised themselves above the condition of day

[1] I never called myself a Socialist, only a "Social Reformer."

labourers. You can find such a state of society among the Zulus of Africa or the Red Indians of America. Those savage tribes have no wealth, no machinery, no culture, no upper classes. Is their condition so enviable that you wish to destroy our ancient civilization in order to return to it?

The figures you give as to the distribution of the income of this country I believe to be entirely wrong. You say that out of a production of thirteen hundred millions (£1,300,000,000) the wage-earning class receive only three hundred millions (£300,000,000), and capitalists and profit-mongers all the rest. From the best information I possess I estimate the total production of the nation is not more than one thousand millions (£1,000,000,000)[1] at the outside, of which the wage-earners receive over five hundred millions (£500,000,000), or fully one-half. The remainder is divided among all the other classes of society, such as landlords, farmers, merchants, shopkeepers, lawyers, physicians, clergymen, schoolmasters, innkeepers, publicans, members of the army and navy, etc., amounting with their families to many millions of people.

All these you treat as mere drones, who contribute nothing to the well-being of the nation. You say "all wealth is due to labour," and you argue that these people produce nothing; the fact is, that they produce quite as much of the wealth as do the labourers themselves. What is the reason that a workman in England earns from 3*s*. to 5*s*. a day, while in India and China he works as hard and earns 3*d*. to 6*d*. a day? It is just because the intelligence and capital of the classes who employ labour have provided the machinery and the numberless appliances that render labour so much more effective.

The thirty millions (30,000,000) of people in Great Britain produce more wealth than the four hundred millions (400,000,000) of China, and an English workman earns as much wages as ten or fifteen Chinese, mainly because of the skill with which the labour of the country is applied, and the ample capital provided by employers.

The single invention of Watt—the steam engine—has added more to the wealth of this country than a million pair of hands could do. Were it not for the intelligence, the skill, and the capital of the employing classes, wages would be no higher than in the West of Ireland or in Russia, say about one shilling a day, and the country could not support half the people who now live in it. It would be just as sensible for the hands and feet to complain that the head was a useless member because it did not walk nor dig, as to say that mere hand labour was the only source of wealth. The fact is, the organizing brain is just as necessary as the hands and feet; that is the skill and capital of the employer, as the labour he employs. They are, in fact, absolutely essential to each other, and it is both cruel and unjust to attempt to provoke a quarrel between them.

You say that the "factory lords," "slave drivers," etc., take nearly all the wealth and leave hardly anything to the labourers.

[1] I have considerable doubts whether the net production of wealth in this country reaches so much as this, at present low prices.

Just when your Manifesto reached me, there also arrived the yearly accounts of a factory in which I am a shareholder. I find we paid in wages last year £17,054, while the shareholders received as profit and interest on capital £1,374; that is, we paid thirteen times as much wages as we derived profit for ourselves from the undertaking. We earned just two per cent. (2 %), and we are called "slave drivers" because we carry on a difficult and costly business, which gives a living to about one thousand persons, and leaves us this trifling recompense. I believe if you were to examine the accounts of all the factories in the country, you would find that they paid, on the average, from five to ten times as much in wages as they earned in profit to the proprietors. I speak with a pretty extensive knowledge of the great cotton industry of Lancashire, which gives maintenance to two or three millions of people, directly and indirectly, and I feel certain that I am within the mark when I say that all the capital invested in it, and all the toil and anxiety of those who conduct it, have not earned so much as five per cent. per annum (5 %) during the past ten years, and I know of many concerns that have not earned half as much. The "slave drivers," as you call them, have a most careworn and anxious life; very many of them, after struggling for years, and working far harder than their operatives, have become bankrupt, and some have died of broken hearts. The struggle and strain of life among them are quite as great, if not greater, than among their workpeople; the rate of wages absorbs nearly all the profit earned, and if it were advanced even a fraction further, it would either make the employers bankrupt, or oblige them to close their factories and dismiss their operatives.

We work under the hottest foreign competition, and if the cost of producing goods were increased by even one-tenth, I believe we should lose much of our foreign trade, and a great part of our workpeople would be reduced to pauperism. I believe most of the leading trades of the country to be in the same position; in all of them the rate of profit is very small, and the great bulk of the earnings goes to labour. I speak with thorough knowledge of the cotton trade, and I wish you would be equally careful as to the accuracy of your statements. I know of some trades which were ruined by strikes organized by the workmen, at the instigation of ignorant agitators, with the result of causing untold misery to the operatives themselves. This was the outcome of the last great strike among the colliers of the Forest of Dean. Trade was driven from the district, and cannot be brought back to it. It is, believe me, a most serious responsibility to stir up hatred and strife between employers and employed.

Let me now say a word about what you call "slave wages." Since the beginning of this century wages have doubled, and on an average money has at least as great a purchasing power as then. In no country on the Continent are wages so high as in Great Britain, while the hours of labour are much shorter here.[1] The amount of money in the

[1] Hours worked in factories in Great Britain . . 54 to 56 per week.
On the Continent, usually . . . . . 65 to 70 ,,

savings banks, which represents the savings of the poor, has increased I suppose, tenfold. Many beginning as labourers have by industry and thrift acquired large fortunes, and great numbers of working men are shareholders in co-operative companies, where they divide among themselves all the fruits of their labour as you desire. I rejoice in all that raises the condition of the working classes in a *lawful manner*. I am as anxiously desirous as you can be to improve the condition of the poor both morally and materially. I have for many years laboured among them, and have relieved hundreds; indeed, I believe I may say thousands of cases of distress. I have inquired into the cause of the poverty of great numbers of distressed people, and my experience is that the greater part of all the misery in this country is the result of intemperance,[1] and the want of thrift and forethought.

I have in very many cases tried to assist persons in distress by giving them situations, or making them loans of money, and in most cases it was unavailing because they proved to be dissipated and untrustworthy; and after much earnest thought I have come to the conclusion that the misery in our great towns, which I deplore as much as you do, is largely the result of moral causes, and can only be cured by moral means aided by wise legislation. Were we to divide the wealth of the country among these poor, miserable people, most of them would in a short time waste it, and sink themselves lower than ever.

I admit that there are many painful cases of decent labouring men, and still more of women, who cannot get full employment, and whose life is a very hard one. This arises from the rapid increase of population—the number of the people increases faster than employment; no human laws can deal with this cause of poverty. If young people will marry and bring large families into existence without any means of supporting them, misery and pauperism are their inevitable lot. Were the State to engage to find employment for all who married, and to maintain their families, we should soon have a vast pauper population who would eat up all the substance of the country, make the State bankrupt, and only find its own cure in dreadful famines, like that of Ireland in 1848, or those that periodically desolate India and China. There is no permanent way by which a people can be elevated except by thrift, foresight and industry, and these again spring from a moral and religious training.

I hope that the condition of the masses may steadily improve as education and intelligence spread; but the surplus population must emigrate, otherwise wages will be prevented from rising, and surely it is better to advise men who cannot get work here to emigrate to Canada, where each settler receives 160 acres of virgin land rent free, than to dangle before them the wild and visionary dream of confiscating the land of this little island, which if divided among the people

[1] Eighty millions sterling is estimated to be spent by the working classes in intoxicating drink annually.

would not yield two acres apiece [1] to each person now living in Great Britain, and would simply reproduce the misery of the poor cotters in the West of Ireland.

I have written you at some length, because I feel grieved to see such dangerous and misleading doctrines preached to the poor. I, myself, condemn the selfish use of wealth as much as any one can do. I long for a happier time for the labouring poor as much as you can do, but let us strive to bring this about in the old, well-tried path of obedience to the commands of God, and in charity towards all men.

Letter No. II.

I have duly received your letter of the 2nd instant, in which you refer to three points in mine to which you object. The first is "the figures as to production." You quote Mr. Robert Giffen, of the Board of Trade, as your authority for putting the production at thirteen hundred millions sterling (£1,300,000,000). I have corresponded with Mr. Giffen, and he informs me that he did not estimate the *production* at that figure, but the total income of the people, arrived at by adding together the income of every person in the nation. You must surely know that these two things are entirely distinct. A vast amount of income is in this way counted twice, or indeed often three or four times over, as the income of all the non-productive classes is drawn from that of the productive. I mean the income of clergymen, physicians, literary men, lawyers, schoolmasters, domestic servants, innkeepers, army and navy, and a multitude of others. These classes are surely as useful to mankind as any, but they are not direct producers of wealth.

Mr. Giffen, far from estimating the total wages earned at three hundred millions, inclines to put them at six hundred millions; but I will call them five hundred millions,[2] putting together the views of the best statists. It thus appears that wages claim half the wealth produced, instead of less than one quarter, as you say.

The other half largely consists of products which would lose all their value if there were no rich consumers, such for instance as fine houses and furniture, pictures, works of art, carriages, etc. The production of these gives employment to millions of people, and if your views were carried out they would be left destitute, and the wealth produced by them could neither be sold or divided, for no rich persons would remain to use it. It is quite deceptive to say that the production of *divisible wealth* is £1,000,000,000; a great part of it would evaporate as completely in the process of dividing as the value of Windsor Castle would, if it were pulled down and the stones that compose it distributed among the people.

It is also to be noted that the great bulk of the expenditure of the rich goes ultimately in the wages of labour. A rich man builds a

[1] And it must be remembered much of this land is composed of mountains and moors, and is not fit for cultivation.

[2] Mr. Leone Levi has just made a careful estimate of the earnings of the working class in the United Kingdom, and puts it at 521 millions sterling.

house ; nine-tenths of the cost goes to the building trades employed. He buys furniture and carriages, and far the greater part goes to the workmen who produce them. He keeps a number of domestic servants ; and so with every part of his expenditure, it will be found on examination that most of it goes to the support of labour. The vast population of London is largely maintained by the expenditure of the rich, who draw their incomes from all parts of the world, and who prefer to live here because of the peace and security that have long prevailed ; but let England be disturbed, as Ireland was a few years ago, and those rich residents would go to other climes, and withdraw that employment which keeps masses of the population in existence. The suffering that would be caused in London by a social revolution would be awful to think of—it would be a repetition, on a far greater scale, of what Paris suffered during the German siege, when the people were reduced to eating rats.

Our fabric of society is all so closely compacted together that when you pull out the rafters of the house, i.e., the employing class, the whole edifice tumbles down. This coveted wealth would vanish like a dream—you would "kill the goose that laid the golden eggs," and in place of happiness you would bring misery into countless homes.

I believe that "an ounce of fact is worth a pound of theory," and would recommend you to examine the proportion of wages paid to profit earned in the great manufacturing and mining industries of Great Britain. It will greatly surprise me if wages be not found to take at least seven-eighths of the total profit earned.[1] Many industrial companies are now conducted upon joint stock principles, and publish accounts, so that you can easily obtain this information if you wish.[2]

You say that the Income Tax returns show that incomes over £150 amount to just six hundred millions? If this be the case, how misleading is your statement that "landlords, capitalists, and profit-mongers take one thousand millions of the national production."

Now as to your second statement. You charge the heavy death rate in certain parts of Liverpool "to the infamous slave drivers, who crush them"—the workers—"into such frightful social surroundings."

[1] I feel so sure of the truth of this, that if a Commission be appointed to inquire into the wages paid compared with profits on capital employed in the four largest trades in the kingdom, viz., cotton, wool, coal, and iron, for the last five years, I will engage to pay £1,000 to the London charities if the amount of net profit earned by capital comes to one-fourth of the amount paid in wages. I much doubt if it will exceed one-tenth on the average of the five years ending with 1884, and yet your Manifesto states that "those who labour return the value of their entire day's wages to their employers in the first two or three hours of their day's work!!"

I would recommend that the Commission be composed half of workmen and half of employers.

[2] I am quite aware that in London there is a great amount of "slop work" done at miserable wages. The excessive competition of poor struggling women has reduced them almost to starvation, and yet in the British Colonies domestic servants are so scarce that they will command wages of 15s. or 20s. per week with their food. Surely emigration is the true remedy.

I am one of these "infamous slave drivers," who has laboured for many years to improve the homes and social surroundings of the poor. If you had done as much yourself, you would not have used such bitter and unjust language. You would have known by experience what is the chief cause of this misery. I enclose you a speech I delivered in the Liverpool Town Council on "local option," in which I stated—and the statement was not contradicted—that the expenditure upon intoxicating drink in Liverpool was equal to two and a half millions sterling annually, or to the entire earnings of fifty thousand families of the class of common labourers.[1]

This is the chief cause of the heavy death rate and its attendant misery.

A large portion of our working classes are now total abstainers, and they live as long as the upper classes, as proved by the Life Insurance Companies founded upon temperance principles. These working men do not live in the places you allude to, but in good houses, and in a respectable manner. I have known, however, many skilled artisans, able to earn 6*s*. or 7*s*. a day, who, through drunkenness, chose to live with their families in single rooms, for which they paid 2*s*. a week, while spending 15*s*. or 20*s*. weekly in drink.

In addition to drunkenness—which, I am happy to say, is decreasing in a very marked manner, owing to the "Cocoa Rooms" which we have established, and to many other social improvements—we suffer also from chronic over-supply of unskilled labour along our docks, and so far from high wages remedying this, it has made it worse. The wages of common porters, when I came to Liverpool, were 3*s*. 6*d*. a day; during the American War, or soon after, when trade was brisk in Liverpool, they were advanced to 4*s*. 6*d*., with the result that a crowd of poor people came from Ireland and the rural parts of England, attracted by the high rates. Ever since then there has not been, on an average, more than four days' work per week for common labourers. Now, four days' work at 4*s*. 6*d*. is 18*s*. per week, and six days' work at 3*s*. 6*d*. is 21*s*. per week. So the high wages are a questionable boon.

I venture to assert that if we raised the rate of wages to 6*s*. a day, there would be such a crowd of immigrants, not only from Ireland and England, but from Germany, Poland, Sweden, and other European countries that in a short time there would only be two or three days' employment for each person, and the weekly earnings of labourers would be less than they are now. It is, in fact, impossible to raise the wages of labour above what trade can afford, or the supply of labour permit. You might as soon try to make water run up a hill. If you were to pass laws that the wages of common labour all over the country should be 6*s*. a day, you would soon see hordes of poor immigrants from the Continent coming to this country and deluging the labour market. After a while multitudes of Chinese would come (as they have been pouring into California), and the country would

[1] Recent statistics prove that this estimate is too large. Liverpool now consumes much less drink per head than Manchester and other towns.

You advocate "the repudiation or rapid extinction of the National debt."[1]

I should think few Englishmen are so destitute of patriotism as to wish their country degraded to the condition of bankrupt States like Turkey or Peru. No such shameful event ever happened in the history of mankind as a nation possessed of such wealth as England breaking faith with its creditors. It need hardly be added that such a course would put an end to the British Empire, and expose our country to the just contempt of mankind. The interest on the National debt now amounts to but two per cent. of the National income, on your own showing; the whole Imperial taxation of the country is only six per cent., being less than any nation of Europe pays, and yet you propose to ruin the credit of our country and reduce it to a fourth-rate Power, in order to escape this trifling burden. I am sure that the working classes are too proud of their country to listen for a moment to such shameful counsels; and would wish it to stand in the future, as it has done in the past, at the very head of the nations for honour and integrity.

I will conclude by saying that the people you address ought to know that the views of your "Manifesto" closely resemble those of the Russian Nihilists and the Communists of Paris and New York. These views can never gain the upper hand until reverence for God is killed out of the hearts of men, and their course has always been stained in other countries by murder and every crime.

The first French Revolution massacred or exiled nearly all the ministers of religion and the upper classes; publicly proclaimed the abolition of Christianity, and installed a harlot as the Goddess of Reason! The Communists of Paris, in 1871, sought to burn down their beautiful city, and, if they gained the upper hand again, would repeat the horrors of the first French Revolution.

When men throw off the restraints of religion their course is fast downwards, and the end is national ruin. Such doctrines have never taken much hold of the honest and practical people of this country. I trust they never may; for if they do, this great Empire, founded by our forefathers, will assuredly break to pieces, and become as much a thing of the past as the Empires of Rome or Assyria. The English-speaking race has won its great position in the world by its industry, self-reliance and obedience to law, and they are the worst enemies of our people who would try and undermine these principles, and I would entreat you, even yet, to abandon a course which can bring nothing but misery in its train.

POSTSCRIPT.

I add a table of the proportionate numbers and wealth of the different classes in the United Kingdom, as compared with those in the leading European countries, taken from an able paper by Mr. Mulhall, in the *Contemporary Review* of February, 1882. It shows that personal

[1] I observe the word "repudiation" is struck out of the later issues, but the general scope of the document implies it.

property (not land) is more widely diffused here than in any other country of Europe, and that the income of all classes is higher.

In the preceding pages I have shown the numerical progress that the various nations have made in many important particulars, but there are many other points in which figures are of no assistance, and which are yet unquestionable proofs of the "levelling up" of the social strata. Why do we no longer see beggars sold by auction in Holland, or women yoked to the plough in Belgium, or little chimney-sweeps smothered in London chimneys, as forty years ago? Simply because of the rise of the middle class. And if England is still ahead of the rest of Europe, she owes her proud position to the fact that no other country has so numerous a middle class as ours.

The following table shows the ratio of each class and average income in the various countries:—

	Ratio.			Average.		
	Rich.	Middle.	Working.	Rich.	Middle.	Working.
United Kingdom	3·36	27·33	69·31	£1,500	£260	100[1]
France	2·05	21·64	76·31	800	200	85
Germany	1·28	7·30	91·42	734	160	76
Italy	0·55	3·57	95·88	520	60	40
Spain	0·72	3·88	95·40	880	140	43
Russia	0·15	0·75	99·10	3,800	200	33

I subjoin a second table, showing the improvement in the condition of the people since 1840.

It is astonishing, that while the population of the island of Great Britain has risen 63 per cent. since 1840, the wages of workmen, and even of maidservants, are now 50 per cent. higher.

The consumption of food per inhabitant is the best test of improvement in the working classes, viz.:—

		1840.	1880.
Tea	ozs.	22	73
Sugar	lbs.	15	54
Wheat	,,	269	358
Meat	,,	84	118

At the same time the increase of depositors in savings' banks has been from 3 per cent. of population to 10½ per cent., and the ratio of paupers has fallen to 3 per cent. of the inhabitants of the United Kingdom, the lowest known since the beginning of the century. As a further instance of improvement, the persons unable to sign the marriage register fell from 42 per cent. in 1840 to 23 per cent. in 1878.

These statements are hardly consistent with the gloomy views put forward in your Manifesto; they show we are making substantial progress, though none will admit more readily than I that much still requires to be done.

[1] I suppose that this includes the total earnings of each family, and seems to me too high, but the proportionate earnings compared with the Continent are about correct.

Mr. Leone Levi puts the average earnings of each working class family in United Kingdom at 32s. per week—if Ireland be not included, Great Britain alone will stand at fully 35s. per week, or £91 per annum.

Appendix IX

PUBLICATION OF SCANDALOUS AND INDECENT EVIDENCE.

Speech of SAMUEL SMITH, ESQ., M.P., *on moving a Resolution respecting the Publication of Indecent Evidence in Divorce Cases, delivered in the House of Commons, Friday, April 22, 1887.*

MR. SAMUEL SMITH (Flintshire), who had the following Notice on the Paper, which he was precluded by the forms of the House from moving :—

That this House deplores the evil done to public morals by the publication in the newspapers of the offensive details of divorce cases, and of others of an indecent character, and urges upon the Government the need of strengthening the law against the publication of obscene matter.

said : The subject which I desire to bring before the House is one of a painful character, and nothing but a strong sense of public duty would have induced me to take this course ; but I have been so deeply impressed by the injury done to public morals by the foul reports of divorce cases which have recently appeared in the public press that I could not shirk this duty, and I must ask the indulgence of the House for a short time while I draw their attention to so distasteful a subject. I believe I may state with truth that a widespread feeling exists in this country that something must be done to check this evil, and that feeling is shared by the House, as is shown by the fact that fully 260 members have responded to an appeal to take action in this matter. I may add that shortly before Parliament met a meeting of the magistracy of Liverpool was held, presided over by the Mayor, at which this resolution was carried *nem. con.* :—

That this meeting of magistrates sitting at Liverpool, having been specially convened by the Mayor to consider the injury done to the public morals by the publication of detailed reports of divorce cases, is of opinion that it is desirable that the publication of such details should be forbidden by law, and that the same rule should apply to all cases of an indecent character.

Several meetings of a similar kind were held in other towns to the same effect ; indeed, I may say that something like unanimity exists that a check should be put upon the licence of a portion of the Press. It is only of late years that this evil has grown to such magnitude ;

formerly the Press used to prune these reports, so as to deprive them of prurient details ; but, of late years, the habit of reporting at great length has suddenly developed, and some of the lower class of papers have even gone so far as to give verbatim reports of the foulest details of vice. The better class of journals for long resisted this vile practice ; but, gradually, one could see the growth of the habit even among them, and if we go on at the rate we are doing there will soon be few exceptions to the rule. Last year was the worst for bad divorce cases for many years, and the evil done by the moral pestilence that emanated from our Divorce Court will never be fully known and measured. There were weeks together when the chief matter of the Press, and of private conversation, was the disgusting details of these infamous cases ; a malarious fog brooded over the country, poisoning the moral atmosphere like the emanations from a pest-house.

But what I ask the House chiefly to consider is the effect upon the morals of the young. It is now impossible to keep the newspaper out of the hands of children and domestic servants ; it is part of the daily life of the country. Is there a father in this House who would like his boys and girls to read these abominable cases ? I believe there is hardly one who did not use his utmost endeavour to keep them out of their hands ; but how vain is it nowadays to hide the newspaper. Our towns are full of revolting placards which thrust this odious knowledge upon every one. I believe in but few cases can children be kept from this guilty knowledge, and it is impossible for them to get it without their minds being soiled. All moralists, even in heathen countries, have held that children should be kept innocent in mind as long as possible ; but that is virtually impossible now, and probably there never was a time since the world began when children were so widely corrupted by familiarity with vice as in London in this nineteenth century of Christianity. I will read to the House a letter I have received from one who was formerly a successful head master of a great public school—I refer to Archdeacon Farrar. He writes :—

> I am very glad that you are endeavouring to secure some legal means of suppressing the publication of needless and demoralizing details in divorce cases. No wise-man would wish to prevent the publicity which is an effective punishment of guilt ; but the deterrent influence of publicity in cases of proved guilt can be perfectly secured without flooding the newspapers with the *minutiae* of corrupting narratives. Even Tacitus, the historian of the worst epoch of the Roman Empire, lays down the rule—"*Ostendi debent scelera dum puniuntur, abscondi flagitia.*" As the head master of a great public school, I found it wholly impossible to limit the perusal of newspapers ; and I am sure that every head master in England would tell you that the lengthy and long-continued reports of profligate conduct in the higher ranks of society are fruitful in evil influences upon the minds of the young. The careful supervision over the reading of the young, which is exercised in all Christian homes, is frequently rendered quite nugatory by the licentious matter with which they become familiarized when they are at school.

I believe this weighty opinion fairly represents that of all the heads

of public schools in the country; and it applies almost as much to girls' schools; and I have been told of painful consequences from reading this literature in them. Then the vast number of children that run about our streets become perfectly familiar with every kind of vileness; indeed, I often wonder whether the children in heathen lands are exposed to such contamination as that vast multitude of poor uncared-for children who run wild about the streets of our great cities.

And this leads me to say that, accompanying this abuse of the Newspaper Press, there has grown up a fearful amount of depraving literature in this country. A perfect flood of immoral books has come over here of late years from abroad; translations of the bestial novels of Zola, and others of a similar school, are now pouring into this country; and it is almost impossible to enforce the law against such works, while we allow matter equally corrupting to be published by the daily Press without let or hindrance. I fear there are too many tokens that this country is going backward, not forward, in the matter of morality; an insidious laxity is creeping over society; wickedness in high places is condoned in a way that would not have been possible in the earlier years of Her Majesty's reign. In these matters the descent of a nation is terribly rapid; the severe morality of the Puritans was followed by the profligate times of Charles II., and it looks very much as if England was going through the same process again. I appeal to those who regard the religion and morality of a nation as its highest and noblest possession to do something to check the flood of impure literature which is poisoning the young. If nothing is done to stop it I believe our course will be rapidly downward, and the end will be that of the great nations of antiquity who perished from their own vices.

I do not underrate the difficulties of this question. I am aware that this country regards publicity as the chief safeguard of justice, and that it values very highly the liberty of the Press. I do not propose that we should close the Courts of Law when divorce cases are tried. I am fully alive to the importance of branding vice by public exposure, and the Press should be allowed reasonable liberty of reporting; but surely there is some middle course between totally suppressing reports of divorce cases, as they now do in France, and publishing the most prurient details. It will be for the wisdom of this House to draw the line, and I feel sure that a large section of the British Press will rejoice to be freed from the competition of the lower class of papers, which live by pandering to the basest appetites of human nature.

I am prepared for the objection of some that we want to shield the wealthy and the great. Now, for my own part, I wish to say that instead of shielding them I would rather they were pilloried tenfold more; the conduct of some of the upper classes in this country would disgrace heathendom; they are jeopardizing the order to which they belong; and if many such exposures take place like those of last year the country may be brought to the verge of a social revolution. For my part, I would not move a finger to arrest the just

indignation of the people from titled profligates; but I am not prepared to let the whole nation be poisoned by the reports of their debauchery. After all, it is more important to protect the morals of 36,000,000 people, of whom 6,000,000 are children at the most impressionable time of life, than to frighten a few hundred wealthy profligates. In this, as in other things, one has to consider the greatest good of the greatest number. No other nation, so far as I know, permits such extended details of divorce cases. In France it is altogether forbidden; and I doubt whether other European countries allow such latitude as we do.

Let the House further consider the injury done to our good name by the republication of these vile reports all over the world. Some of the worst of these cases were telegraphed to America, the Colonies, and India. They create the impression abroad that we are a most corrupt nation; they tarnish the good name of the country; they are taken too much as samples of average British morality. It is certainly not the way to keep the respect or the affection of the Colonies. But it is in India that the effect is worst. The native papers there comment on these trials, and assume that their masters have little need to teach them a higher civilization. No one can tell how far they lower the *prestige* of this country; and, after all, we hold India more by *prestige* than by force. It is most humiliating for an Englishman abroad to have these odious cases cast up as a reproach upon his nation; he can but hang his head and blush as these hideous records are telegraphed and published week after week.

I think I am not mistaken in assuming that the House will generally agree with me thus far. It is when we come to the remedy for this that immense difficulties are encountered. No doubt the simplest method would be to hear all such cases *in camera*; but that method was rejected when the House established the Divorce Court, and it is not likely to alter its decision now. Then there is the plan of giving the Judges power to prevent the publication of what they consider unfit details of evidence. It is alleged that they possess this power theoretically; but it has practically become obsolete; certain it is that the Judges will not now incur the odium of punishing the Press through contempt of Court, unless under express Act of Parliament. I think I may venture to assert that we cannot look for a remedy to the voluntary action of the Judges. I think the view that will commend itself to the House is that we must strengthen the whole law about obscene publications, and prohibit offenders from pleading in defence that it is the report of a public trial. It is too important and difficult a matter to be dealt with by private members; and I shall propose that the duty be laid on the Government, and I have good reason to believe that it will respond to the appeal. In conclusion I would wish to quote from a circular, signed by some of the most illustrious names in England; a circular which exactly expresses our views, with the single exception that we seek to give legislative effect to them, believing that in no other way can they be made operative:—

We, the undersigned, respectfully suggest to all those who have the control of the daily Press the desirability of some combined action by which they may minimize, if they cannot wholly suppress, the details of divorce cases and criminal trials, such as those which of late have occupied so many columns of the newspapers.

We are aware that the fear of publicity is one of the most powerful deterrents to the commission of crime, nor have we the least desire to shelter the misdeeds of offenders because of any position in society which they may occupy.

But we have a strong conviction that the necessary publicity could be secured without divulgence of details of a demoralizing character, and we have reason to fear that the full record of incidents in these cases ministers to a diseased appetite, and produces a most unwholesome effect on many minds.

We desire further to call attention to the inevitable evils which must result from thus familiarizing with vice the minds of tens of thousands of young persons of both sexes from whom, in these days, it is impossible to keep the daily newspapers.

We do not reflect for one moment on the motives of any who have considered it part of their duty to publish full reports of these trials, but we are sure that a combined effort to keep the pages of newspapers as free as possible from the stain of such impurities would be conducive to the public good.

This document was signed among others by the Duke of Westminster, Lord Selborne, Archdeacon Farrar, the Right. Hon. W. E. Gladstone, the late Lord Iddesleigh, Professors Huxley and Tyndall, Cardinal Manning, and many others. No words of mine can add to the weight of this appeal. I leave it in the hands of the House, with the full belief that it will act rightly, and do what it can to stop one of the most deadly evils from which this country suffers. I conclude by drawing attention to the resolution, of which I have given notice, and which I trust the House will accept.

Appendix X

THE DIFFICULTIES OF THE IRISH QUESTION.

Speech delivered at Garston, Monday, December 30, 1889, *by* SAMUEL SMITH, M.P.

I FIRST invite your attention to the great measure which Mr. Gladstone introduced into the Parliament of 1886, and I will say at the outset that I do not think our great leader ever displayed more marvellous ability than he did at that time, in digesting and throwing into clearness of outline one of the most difficult questions which an English statesman ever had to grapple with. We have been accustomed to hear that Bill denounced by our opponents in the severest language, as containing almost every fault it was possible to embody in a Bill; but I retain the opinion I formed regarding it at the time —that it was a marvel of constructive statesmanship. It no doubt raised some great difficulties, but it also avoided some great difficulties, and I defy any statesman to solve this question without raising difficulties, when he has to devise the machinery for carrying it out. Mr. Gladstone had the choice of adopting one or other of two alternatives in preparing his measure. He had either to draft it in the main on what we may call the colonial pattern, or on the federal pattern. The first of these great types is the one represented by our own colonies, and the last is represented by the States in the American Union, and by the provinces in the Dominion of Canada. Now, Mr. Gladstone's Bill in the main followed the colonial type. It did not slavishly adhere to it, but took it in the main as a pattern to go upon. Ireland was to have a legislature of her own for dealing exclusively with her own local affairs. Irish members were to cease to sit at Westminster, at least for a time, and Ireland was to contribute a fixed amount to the Imperial revenue. These were the main outlines of Mr. Gladstone's Bill, and it possessed this great advantage: that it would have relieved the British Parliament of Irish discussions, and freed it from the incessant friction and waste of time caused by having a body of Irish members in Parliament in permanent opposition to a large body of British members. There is no doubt that this would have been an enormous advantage to us in regard to the transaction of our own proper business. This was the main idea which dominated Mr. Gladstone's scheme, but it had undoubtedly this countervailing effect

that the exclusion of the Irish members from Westminster would have tended to the idea of separation, and would have given too much of the appearance of an independent legislature to the Irish Parliament. This was the view undoubtedly taken throughout the country. The view even of the majority of the Liberal Party, after full consideration, was that the Irish members must not be excluded from Westminster, but that they must remain an integral part of the Imperial Parliament, in order to maintain the integrity of the United Kingdom, and in order also to maintain the paramount authority of the Imperial Parliament; for if was quite clear that if Irish members were not to sit in Westminster, it would scarcely have been competent for the Parliament at Westminster, representing British constituencies alone, to overrule the decision of the Dublin Parliament in regard to Irish affairs. The case was, however, wholly different when Irish members were to sit at Westminster, because then it would have been competent for the British Parliament, containing both British and Irish members, to review, if necessary, the action of the Parliament in Dublin.

I take it for granted that in the next Home Rule Bill that will be presented, provision will be made for the Irish members to remain at Westminster, and that the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament will be asserted in the most absolute manner. But then we are confronted with a great difficulty, and every one who has thought upon the subject has felt its force, and our opponents have made the most of it. The difficulty is that if we grant a Parliament to Ireland to deal exclusively with Irish affairs, and have the Irish members sitting at Westminster as they are at present, and voting upon every question that comes before the British Parliament, they will be in this singular and anomalous position that they will have double power as compared with members representing English and Scotch constituencies. They will have in the first place, exclusive control over their own affairs, and in the second place, joint control of our affairs. Now, this position is anomalous and scarcely to be tolerated by the people of this country. The majority of the Liberal Party are most anxious and willing to give the Irish members every right we possess ourselves; but it would be unreasonable to expect, and the Irish members themselves would be the last to ask, that they should possess greater rights than we do ourselves. This anomaly becomes still more apparent when we remember that at the present time Ireland is much more largely represented in regard to population than any other part of the United Kingdom. Ireland at present sends 103 Members to the Parliament at Westminster; but if representation were to be adjusted to population upon the scale of the census to be taken next year, as far as I can make out the Irish representation would be about 86 members, assuming the representation for Great Britain to be the same as now, I calculated on basis of the census for 1891 (and we cannot have a Home Rule Bill before then). Assuming the population of Great Britain then to be 33 millions and that of Ireland 5 millions, and taking the existing representation for Great Britain as the basis, as 33 millions

is to 5, so is 567 to 86. On the other hand, if representation were to be based upon the contribution made to the revenue of the country the Irish representation, I think, would be about 55 members instead of 103. Well, this brings out into greater relief the anomaly and the difficulty that would arise if the Irish members had complete control of their own affairs, and also had a joint share in managing British affairs. Supposing, for instance, that Home Rule were granted, and that the question of Disestablishment for England had become a leading question of the day; and supposing the English people were by a majority opposed to disestablishment, but by means of the Irish vote turning the minority of English members into a majority, the English Church were disestablished, would there not be a sense of grievance in England? Of course there would be, exactly corresponding to what is now felt when the voice of the Irish members is overruled by the voice of the English members. I see, gentlemen, from your applause that you fully agree with me as to the weight of this objection. Now, disestablishment is not the only question; we shall have a great number of questions in the future, such as whether education is to be in any degree denominational, and very important questions which cut very deeply into the feelings of the people, and which divide parties in the sharpest possible manner. I can, therefore, conceive that the sense of hardship and grievance will be very great if the decision of the English people should be overruled by the presence of a large body of the Irish members. Now, to get out of this difficulty, the first scheme that commends itself to every one is to draw a distinction between what we may call imperial and what we may call local business in the Parliament at Westminster. I see from the remarks of some of my friends on the platform that this is the way that at first sight commends itself to their judgment, and I am bound to say that at first sight it also commended itself to mine. But I must be frank with you and tell you that on further consideration I find considerable difficulty in the way. I wish to point this out to you that the questions which come before Parliament are extremely complex and many-sided, and I fear that in many cases it would be impossible to say whether these questions were imperial or non-imperial.

I remember Mr. Gladstone, in his first great speech in introducing the Home Rule Bill, saying that it passed the wit of man to draw a distinction between imperial and non-imperial business. I believe he has since given expression to the view that it would be possible to draw the distinction, and I, for my part, should be exceedingly pleased if we could draw such a distinction, but so far as a cursory examination of the subject enables me to form a judgment, I do think it would be exceedingly difficult. Then, another difficulty that occurs to me is this: Suppose we did succeed in drawing a line between imperial and local business, the proceedings of Parliament are so mixed up that we should pass from the one to the other class of subjects with great rapidity, and it is not possible, in arranging the business, to fix for any length of time beforehand what would be the sub-

ject for discussion on a given day. You can therefore understand the great inconvenience that Irish members would have to endure in waiting in the lobbies at Westminster till the business in which they were interested came on. It might come on early or it might come on late, or it might not come on at all on a certain night. And when it did come on no one could tell whether it would last one, two, or three nights, whether it would die out in an hour or two, or whether it would be prolonged for nine or ten hours. And then it would be sure to happen when we were discussing what would be local business during one part of the evening that Government business would have to be taken in the other part. We should have, perhaps, the Land Question in England, the Liquor Question in England, or Disestablishment in Wales up to, say, eleven o'clock, and then they would have the Government asking the Vote of Supply. The Government has to get a certain number of votes of supply in order to push forward its business. Well, we cannot hide from ourselves the extreme inconvenience of Irish members attending Westminster and hanging about the lobbies, and waiting for some imperial business which might not come on at all or not till after eleven o'clock. I am afraid it is a circumstance which would very often occur, and it is a practical difficulty which I do not see my way out of. I do not wish to raise difficulties merely for the sake of raising them; my object is rather to throw out some suggestions for discussion by the Liberal Party, because my belief is that the mind of the country should now be exercised in trying to solve these difficulties in place of waiting till we are all brought together at Westminster, two or three years hence it may be, intending to pass a Home Rule Bill, but all at sea as to how we are to do it.

There is another difficulty in connexion with this division between imperial and local business, which strikes me as being even more serious than the one I have mentioned, and it is this: that we should have the Government of the day resting for its support on two different majorities. Now, as you know, the very basis of the British Constitution is that the Government rests for its support upon the majority of the elected representatives of the people, and it is bound by our constitutional practice to resign the reins of office when it has not a majority. Now, here is what might happen, and what would certainly happen if we had a double Parliament containing at one portion of the business merely the British members, and for British business, and at another time the Irish members added to it for imperial business. Say, for instance, that we had a Conservative Government in power, they might have a majority until the Irish members came in and turned the scale, putting it into a minority, and then the Government would be compelled to resign. A Liberal Government succeeds it, and the same thing happens again. The Liberal Government would have a majority, with the Irish members; but as soon as they were withdrawn, and the Government had to deal with such questions as Disestablishment or the Liquor Laws, then the Liberal Government should be in a minority and have to resign, so that we should be

in a perpetual see-saw. That would be a state of things which would be absolutely intolerable, and I confess I see no way out of it under present conditions.

After thinking over this matter for a year or two, I am rather coming round to the opinion that we must adopt a middle course—a compromise—and give up the idea of separation between imperial and local business, and I wish to throw out some suggestions, not as conclusive but as tentative, with the view of provoking discussion and seeing what we can contribute towards the solution of these difficulties. I have shown you that there are great difficulties springing out of what we may call a double Parliament at Westminster—a Parliament at one time British, and at another representing the whole of the United Kingdom—and that it would be better to retain one sole Parliament to do the whole work to be done. Now, supposing we were to retain the Irish members permanently for the whole work of the Session, and if 103 members came over from Ireland, their bulk is so large that they would often turn the scale against British members. We must, therefore, look out for a compromise. I have already stated that if the Irish members were allowed to take part in voting on all questions to come before Parliament at Westminster, the Irish members would be in a privileged position. They would have, on the one hand, exclusive control over their own affairs, and on the other hand they would take part in British affairs; and, therefore, I think we might fairly ask them to give us some compensation—something in return—and I think they would be quite willing to make a sacrifice on their part if we were willing to make a sacrifice on our part. Now, the sacrifice I would be inclined to ask the Irish members to make is this: considering that they would be possessed of double powers, as compared with us, I think we might fairly ask them to consent to a large reduction in their members. At present the Irish are much better represented than any other part of the kingdom. They are much over-represented, in regard to population, and still more in regard to taxation; so that if they are to have a double power, as compared with British members, I think we might very reasonably ask them to take a much smaller representation than at present. We might, therefore, try if we could not agree beforehand upon a rough working compromise, which, so to speak, would suit the genius of the British people, who are not a logical people like the French, but who, when a difficulty arises, usually take a rough and ready means of solving it.

Upon the whole the most practicable method would be for the Irish people to consent to a small permanent delegation at Westminster, to take part in all the business that comes before the Imperial Parliament. I do not think, if they get a satisfactory Home Rule Parliament that the Irish people themselves will wish to have a large delegation. They were willing to accept Mr. Gladstone's first proposal to exclude them for a time. They were so deeply interested in their own affairs that they had no particular desire to take part in our affairs. When you remember that they have been engaged for hundreds of years in

a life and death struggle you can well understand that their attention is concentrated on their own affairs. They are not deeply interested, for instance, in foreign affairs, and therefore my belief is that if the Irish get a satisfactory Home Rule measure for Ireland they will be satisfied with a comparatively small delegation to Westminster, capable of expressing clearly the voice and wishes of Ireland on the subjects which interest her. I would therefore suggest as a practical means of solving the difficulty that a small delegation, perhaps equivalent to their contribution to the imperial revenue, should be allowed to sit permanently, and take part in every subject that comes before the Parliament at Westminster. The effect of that would be that the representatives of the British constituencies would not be overbalanced by a large mass of Irish members, and I think that a feeling of delicacy would have some effect in preventing the Irish delegation, when parties were pretty evenly balanced, from trying to turn the issue against the wishes of the British people. I merely throw out this suggestion, a somewhat crude one, no doubt, as a sort of working compromise of what is really a very great practical difficulty.

Another plan has been proposed, a much more ambitious one, on which I should like to make a few observations. It has been discussed in Scotland much more largely than in England, though some allusion to it has been occasionally made by English newspapers. This plan is what we may call federalizing the British Constitution—entirely changing the British Constitution and turning it into a constitution similar to what the Dominion of Canada possesses. The plan is to have four Parliaments in the United Kingdom—one for each of the four divisions, England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales, and then one large Imperial Parliament for all, containing representatives from the various parts of the United Kingdom. These four Parliaments would elect four ministries, charged with the domestic affairs of each country; so that we should have altogether five Parliaments and five ministries. We should have separate ministries for England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales, and then an Imperial ministry which should embrace the whole.

There is a certain boldness and grandeur about this scheme which at first sight is attractive; but I am bound, as an honest man, to give you my opinion upon this subject. Those who recommend the federalizing of the British Constitution have scarcely realized the enormous magnitude of the task they propose, which, to my mind, would involve a greater organic change than to turn the present constitution from a monarchy into a republic. Such a change as the last would not be at all, in my humble judgment, so drastic as converting our constitution from what it is at present, a unity of power, into this divided and co-ordinate government which we call federalism. The British Constitution has been growing up for a period of a thousand years. It has, so to speak, sprung out of the necessities of the people. It has adapted itself to the mind, to the character, and even to the peculiarities of the British people. The British Constitution is totally unlike the constitution of any other country; it is full of anomalies,

entirely illogical, but remarkably well fitted like an old suit of clothes to the body of the wearer. The British Constitution is like a pair of shoes which a man has worn for a long time, till they exactly fit the shape of the feet; while these constitutions—which our neighbours the French are always making—may be compared to shoes made by mathematics, very fine to look at, but exceedingly uncomfortable to wear. The British Constitution is simply a bundle of precedents. No author has ever yet given us a complete digest of the Common Law of this country, because it is simply a creation of endless precedents, and so the British Constitution has been growing for centuries, and adapting itself to the wants of the people, until it has become a bundle of incongruities, which is yet extremely suitable to the people. I very much doubt whether any writer could give a perfectly accurate and formal account of the British Constitution; and if we abolished it, and adopted a Federal Constitution, we should have to face a gigantic task, for I do not think it would be possible to graft a Federal Constitution upon ours. The two are totally distinct, and such an attempt would be like the scriptural illustration of putting new cloth into an old garment. The two would not work together, and if we were to make a change it should have to be stock, lock and barrel. We should have to renew the ship from the keel to the topmast, and I do not envy any one who, in an airy mood, would attempt such a task. If we are to go in for federalizing the British Constitution we must make up our minds to do what the Americans did after obtaining their independence. Many people are not aware of how the American Constitution, that masterpiece of political wisdom, came into existence. It did not grow easily; it did not come into existence without pains and labour. The American Constitution sprang out of the Union of thirteen independent States, the thirteen American colonies which acquired their independence in 1783; and they had either to start as independent countries or agree upon a union. Now, it was quite obvious that their best course was to agree upon union, and they devoted the whole strength of their minds to drafting a constitution, and many persons are hardly aware of the fact that the formation of the American Constitution was so difficult that it was upon the very point of collapsing. The first draft was just upon the point of being rejected, and there would have been nothing for it but each of these thirteen republics starting upon its own course, each one jealous of, and antagonistic to, the others. It is generally admitted that but for the great ascendancy of that wonderful man, George Washington, who was able to carry it through and procure its acceptance by the American States, it would have broken down. The extraordinary difficulty encountered in America was to co-ordinate the rights of the States with the rights of the Central government. Each State was extremely jealous of retaining its own local independence, and was very unwilling to hand over to the central government anything that it conceived to belong to itself alone. The difficulty in drawing the line between State and Federal rights was so great that there were times when the great men who conducted America to indepen-

dence almost despaired of the task. They did succeed at last, but let me tell you that it took many years before the lines between State rights and Federal rights were clearly defined, and there were occasions when the federation was in danger of breaking up and when civil war was not remote.

I was in America before the war between the North and South broke out, and I heard State rights discussed on every side till I became perfectly familiar with the subject from the American point of view, and I am bound to say that not only in the South but also by many people in the North it was held that a State in the last resort had the right to secede ; but the majority of the American people did not agree to this doctrine, and Federal rights were asserted as against the State rights in a great civil war, and the American Constitution survived. Behind this, as we all know, the great difficulty of slavery existed. No doubt the States' difficulty might have been tided over but for the Slave Question, and I do not wish to insist too much upon this point, but I do wish to point out that the drawing of lines between a Federal government and the subordinate governments banded together to form one, is no easy task, but is fruitful of opportunities for quarrelling ; and that nothing but the practical good sense of the Americans and a succession of great lawyers and statesmen of extraordinary ability have succeeded in drawing the line between Federal rights and State rights so as to make the American Constitution work smoothly and easily. Now, if any gentleman in this audience does not wholly agree with me on this subject, I would refer him to the greatest work on America that has been published in our times. I refer to that admirable work of Professor Bryce, styled *The American Commonwealth*. I have read it with great care, and I find that it draws out with uncommon distinctness the complexity of the American system and the many differences that had to be reconciled. I do not think that any one who wishes to federalize the British Constitution should make up his mind on the subject till he has read that great work of Professor Bryce, which I believe will be for many years to come the standard authority upon America. To meet the unique condition of things created by federation the Americans had to create a Supreme Court with greater powers than were possessed by any other court of law in the world, as a final court of appeal between the various States of the Union and the Union itself. Questions were frequently occurring between the various States and the Federal government, which were of such extreme difficulty that it was found necessary to create a court of law with absolute power to interpret the constitution, and to decide in the last resort upon such disputes. This great American Court is a body which is unique, so far as I know, in the history of the world ; and if we are going to have a Federal Constitution in this country, the first thing we shall also have to do will be to create a Supreme Court ; and, mind you, this court will have to be supreme over Parliament itself, and even over the Crown, in all matters pertaining to its jurisdiction. Now I ask, are Englishmen prepared for one moment to create a court of law which will

overrule even the sense of Parliament ? I do not believe it. I believe such a change would be far too sweeping and too contrary to the habits and instincts of our British people to have the remotest chance of acceptance ; and I believe that, when this question is fully discussed, and the people know what it involves, the British people, who are extremely practical, will reject it almost unanimously.

These schemes for federalizing the British Constitution have mainly proceeded, so far as we know at present, from Scotland. I myself am Scotch, and therefore you may suppose that I am not disposed to look unfavourably on the aspirations of my country ; but I am bound to say that every statesman's duty is to consider what is best for the whole country. The whole must always be considered before the part, and in the long run it will be found that what is best for the whole will also be found to be best for the part. I think that the Federal scheme will not suit this country, which has one of the most far-reaching histories in the world. Probably no country has a more ancient and more consecutive history. We are like an old oak tree whose roots have grown for hundreds of years deeply into the soil and which cannot be lifted up and transplanted.

There is another way of meeting the difficulty. There are reasonable limits within which the people of Great Britain may rightly ask for greater control of their local affairs. I do not think the Imperial Parliament can properly and entirely satisfy all the wants of every part of Great Britain. There are portions which have wants very distinct (Wales, for instance) from the mass of the British population ; but I think we possess in our local bodies the basis for devolving more local government than we have yet done. I cannot see any great difficulty in ultimately constituting our County Councils into what may be called a system of little local parliaments. I cannot see why, if they prove themselves efficient (and I have no doubt they will), we should not devolve local affairs upon them increasingly, though always subject to the control of the Imperial Parliament. The principle upon which we ought to go in Great Britain is that of devolution, and not that of creating co-ordinate powers. I think that in place of going upon the principle of developing sectional feeling it would be much better to meet the reasonable requirements of local government by increasing the powers of these subordinate bodies which Parliament has created, viz., the County Councils.

Appendix XI

FEMALE SUFFRAGE.

A Letter from THE RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P., *to* SAMUEL SMITH, M.P.

1, CARLTON GARDENS,
April 11, 1892.

DEAR MR. SAMUEL SMITH,—

In reply to your letter, I cannot but express the hope that the House of Commons will not consent to the second reading of the Bill for Extending the Parliamentary Suffrage to Women, which will come before it on the 27th instant.

The Bill is a narrow Bill, inasmuch as it excludes from its operation the entire body of married women; who are not less reflective, intelligent, and virtuous than their unmarried sisters, and who must, I think, be superior in another great element of fitness, namely the lifelong habit of responsible action. If this change is to be made, I certainly have doubts, not yet dispelled, whether it ought to be made in the shape which would thus be given to it by a halting and inconsistent measure.

But it is a change which obviously, and apart from disputable matter, ought not to be made without the fullest consideration and the most deliberate assent of the nation as well as of the Parliament. Not only has there been no such assent, but there has not been even an approach to such consideration. The subject has occupied a large place in the minds of many thoughtful persons, and of these a portion have become its zealous adherents. Just weight should be allowed to their sentiments, and it is desirable that the arguments on both sides should be carefully and generally scrutinized: but the subject is as yet only sectional, and has not really been taken into view by the public mind at large. Can it be right, under these circumstances, that the principle of a change so profound should be adopted? Cannot its promoters be content with that continuance and extension of discussion, which alone can adequately sift the true merits of their cause?

I offer this suggestion in the face of the coming Election. I am aware that no legitimate or effectual use can be made of it for carrying to an issue a question at once so great and so novel; but I do not

doubt, considering the zeal and ability which are enlisted in its favour, that the occasion might be made available for procuring an increase of attention to the subject, which I join with them in earnestly desiring.

There are very special reasons for circumspection in this particular case. There has never within my knowledge been a case in which the franchise has been extended to a large body of persons generally indifferent about receiving it. But here, in addition to a widespread indifference, there is on the part of large numbers of women who have considered the matter for themselves, the most positive objection and strong disapprobation. Is it not clear to every unbiassed mind that before forcing on them what they conceive to be a fundamental change in their whole social function, that is to say in their Providential calling, at least it should be ascertained that the womanly mind of the country, at present so largely strange to the subject, is in overwhelming proportion, and with deliberate purpose, set upon securing it ?

I speak of the change as being a fundamental change in the whole social function of woman, because I am bound in considering this Bill to take into view not only what it enacts, but what it involves. The first of these, though important, is small in comparison with the last.

What the Bill enacts is simply to place the individual woman on the same footing in regard to Parliamentary elections, as the individual man. She is to vote, she is to propose or nominate, she is to be designated by the law as competent to use and to direct, with advantage not only to the community but to herself, all those public agencies which belong to our system of Parliamentary representation. She, not the individual woman, marked by special tastes, possessed of special gifts, but the woman as such, is by this change to be plenarily launched into the whirlpool of public life, such as it is in the nineteenth, and such as it is to be in the twentieth century.

So much for what the Bill enacts : now for what it involves, and involves in the way of fair and rational, and therefore of morally necessary, consequence. For a long time we drew a distinction between competency to vote and competency to sit in Parliament. But long before our electorate had attained to the present popular proportions, this distinction was felt to involve a palpable inconsistency, and accordingly it died away. It surely cannot be revived : and if it cannot be revived, then the woman's vote carries with it, whether by the same Bill or by a consequential Bill, the woman's seat in Parliament. These assertions ought to be strictly tested; But, if they cannot be confuted, do not let them be ignored.

If the woman's vote carries with it the woman's seat, have we at this point reached our terminus, and found a standing ground which we can in reason and in justice regard as final ? Capacity to sit in the House of Commons now legally and practically draws in its train capacity to fill every office in the State. Can we alter this rule and determine to have two categories of Members of Parliament, one

of them, the established and the larger one, consisting of persons who can travel without check along all the lines of public duty and honour, the other, the novel and the smaller one, stamped with disability for the discharge of executive, administrative, judicial or other public duty? Such a stamp would I apprehend be a brand. There is nothing more odious, nothing more untenable, than an inequality in legal privilege which does not stand upon some principle in its nature broad and clear. Is there here such a principle, adequate to show that when capacity to sit in Parliament has been established, the title to discharge executive and judicial duty can be withheld? Tried by the test of feeling, the distinction would be offensive. Would it stand better under the laws of logic? It would stand still worse, if worse be possible. For the proposition we should have to maintain would be this. The legislative duty is the highest of all public duties; for this we admit your fitness. Executive and judicial duties rank below it: and for these we declare you unfit.

I think it impossible to deny that there have been and are women individually fit for any public office however masculine its character; just as there are persons under the age of twenty-one better fitted than many of those beyond it for the discharge of the duties of full citizenship. In neither case does the argument derived from exceptional instances seem to justify the abolition of the general rule. But the risks involved in the two suppositions are immeasurably different. In the one, individual judgment and authority plainly would have to distinguish between childhood and manhood, and to specify a criterion of competency in each case, which is now more conveniently fixed by the uniformity of law. In the other, a permanent and vast difference of type has been impressed upon women and men respectively by the Maker of both. Their differences of social office rest mainly upon causes, not flexible and elastic like most mental qualities, but physical and in their nature unchangeable. I for one am not prepared to say which of the two sexes has the higher and which has the lower province. But I recognize the subtle and profound character of the differences between them, and I must again, and again, and again, deliberate before aiding in the issue of what seems an invitation by public authority to the one to renounce as far as possible its own office, in order to assume that of the other. I am not without the fear lest beginning with the State, we should eventually be found to have intruded into what is yet more fundamental and more sacred, the precinct of the family, and should dislocate, or injuriously modify, the relations of domestic life.

As this is not a party question, or a class question, so neither is it a sex question. I have no fear lest the woman should encroach upon the power of the man. The fear I have is, lest we should invite her unwittingly to trespass upon the delicacy, the purity, the refinement, the elevation of her own nature, which are the present sources of its power. I admit that we have often, as legislators, been most unfaithful guardians of her rights to moral and social equality. And I do not say that full justice has in all things yet been done; but

such great progress has been made in most things, that in regard to what may still remain the necessities for violent remedies has not yet been shown. I admit that in the universities, in the professions, in the secondary circles of public action, we have already gone so far as to give a shadow of plausibility to the present proposals to go farther; but it is a shadow only, for we have done nothing that plunges the woman as such into the turmoil of masculine life. My disposition is to do all for her which is free from that danger and reproach,[1] but to take no step in advance until I am convinced of its safety. The stake is enormous. The affirmation pleas are to my mind not clear, and, even if I thought them clearer, I should deny that they were pressing.

Such being the state of the evidence, and also such the immaturity of the public mind, I earnestly hope that the House of Commons will decline to give a second reading to the Woman's Suffrage Bill.

I remain, dear Mr. S. Smith,

Very faithfully yours,

W. E. GLADSTONE.

[1] On May 3, 1871, I referred to "a presumptive case for *some* change in the law." Then, as now, I thought no change admissible, which would plunge or invite the woman "into the turmoil of masculine life."—W. E. G.

Appendix XII

Letter from MRS. SAMUEL SMITH *to* MISS DOWIE

7, DELAHAY STREET,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.
March 25, 1888.

MY DEAR MISS DOWIE,—

The great event of last Monday has passed over and left behind it a feeling of pleasurable satisfaction of having been in the society of one of the greatest, the noblest, the simplest, and at the same time, one of the most courteous men of the century. Had I the pen and the memory of a Gladstone I would like to tell you all that passed on the occasion of the most historic dinner party we ever had or are ever likely to have.

Mr. Gladstone took me down, and next him sat Archdeacon Farrar, then Amy—taken down by him—Mr. Bryce, Mr. Rathbone, Mr. Mundella, Sir U. K. Shuttleworth, then the host, and beside him Mr. Childers, with Miss Pitt next him (he having taken her down), Mr. Parker, Mr. Barbour, Mr. John Roberts, James Smith, Mr. Osborne Morgan next me. We had thus six members of the late Government. To tell of minor things, the table really looked lovely. We have a lamp with a mirror stand, and springing from the bottom three cornucopia glasses and three drooping crystal leaves; the glasses were filled with orchids and maidenhair from home; the lamp was placed on a mirror oval plateau bordered with an edging nearly two inches high of open Dresden china and with four Dresden figures at the corners (I brought this from Germany). We had a pink shade which threw a lovely shadow over the whole; then we had eight pretty white crystal glasses filled with scarlet anemones and dark ivy leaves (Miss Finch happened to send me them that morning), and six mirror flower pots of palms, and on the table some pale roses and ferns laid down. We had the drawing-room pretty with palms and flowers, and the oak room with the same; it looked so pretty. We assembled there. Mr. G. is always punctual, and was the third to arrive; he was very affable to every one. Mr. Lawrence and the boys were introduced and shook hands with him. He admired the home very much, and was interested in hearing about Jeffries. In going down to dinner I said it was very kind of him to come. "Not at all," he said; "I was very glad indeed to come." When I reached my seat and pointed to his, he said: "May I take the other side so as to have my good ear towards you?" However, I said we thought

he would enjoy being next Archdeacon Farrar, so he took his seat. He talked a good deal to Farrar principally upon ecclesiastical history. I could not catch much of what he said. Then he began to talk of the Italian preacher who is creating so much enthusiasm just now, and asked if I had read some of his sermons. He did not hear him. Then he said to Dr. Farrar and me that he could find no preachers in Italy or France now; that when he had greater powers of locomotion and of hearing that he always sought out the good preachers, but they did not seem to exist now; that he enjoyed hearing them as they were all chosen men and only preached a few times a year and so made a great effort. Now, he said, people complained in our country that the preaching was poor. "I marvel that it is so good; I cannot understand how men can preach such sermons as they do two and three times a week, and that all the year round. I think that at one of the services Scripture should be expounded." I remarked that many clergymen found it more difficult to do this than to preach. "Yes, but it is the people I am considering. It is most important to have their minds stored with Scripture—to have Scripture well expounded to them." (Do many Prime Ministers or Ex-Prime Ministers talk this way?) I asked him if he knew that Toftcombs, which for about two hundred years belonged to the Gladstones, was for sale? We went on from this into the family pedigree, into the burial place of the *Gledstanes*, then how sorry he was the name had been changed—especially as the old name was much finer—that it was not like Jones, Robinson or Williams—I added "or Smith." "No," he said, "that is a very fine name. Do you not know" (quite excited) "the meaning of it? Why we have had goldsmiths, silversmiths, blacksmiths, etc., from the earliest times, and I have no patience with people who change Smith into Smythe and spoil the name; one man even put in a j." I told him my father—who was the clergyman of Biggar parish, in which Toftcombs is, for fifty-two years, and had a beautiful pre-Reformation church—lived with a Mr. Gladstone when he went to the parish till his manse was ready. Then I said the last Gladstone left the place about fifteen years ago, and he said he had met him in Glasgow at a meeting, and was very eloquent, so I said I knew him and described him so as to be sure he was the same. He was a licentiate of the Free Church. Then he said there was a watchmaker who was one of the last there, and I said "and very good watches and clocks he made," and that I had seen one two years ago which belongs to a daughter of Dr. Chalmers. He said he was a second cousin twice removed. We had quite an animated discussion, and I told him one of my father's stories about a man who lived near Biggar, who, Mr. G. said, was a distant connection, and where he had once gone to tea. Every one seemed happy and pleased. Miss Pitt found Mr. Childers very pleasant and inclined to talk. After we three ladies left the table Mr. G. spoke half an hour on the licensing question and on some other points of the Local Government Bill which had been brought in that day. It was a very stormy night, snowing hard, and Mrs. G. came for him about a quarter to

till three when the service begins. Gordon and his fa
rence, Jamie and I went and had a delightful time.
memory and knows every stone of the Abbey. He
again later in the season after the service, when he
to stay longer. It was such a delicate compliment.
elated with our past week's experiences, and no one w
us more than you, only I feel you should have had all t
as you could have made so much more of it. I hav
minute in my descriptions, but I knew you would like
stone looked really beautiful and quite juvenile with
in his button hole, and his crush hat under his arm, ar
seeming to belong to a past generation.

Yours affectionately,
(Signed) MELVIL

P.S.—I forget what we were talking about, but Mr
emphatically: "I am a very strong conservative, M
like to conserve all that is ancient and good, not to de
reform." "Yes," I said, "Mr. Smith always says yo
conservative man in the House, and the safety-valve
He seemed quite pleased and said, "Who says so?"
replied, "Mr. Smith."

Appendix XIII

Reminiscences of W. P. Lockhart

You have asked me to give some reminiscences of the early days of my dear friend, W. P. Lockhart, and I gladly comply with your wishes.

Our friendship commenced in the year 1861, when he was greatly used by God to revive religion among young men in Liverpool and the neighbourhood. I think it was in the year before that he commenced to preach. He was then a noble-looking young man, in the freshness and enthusiasm of youth, twenty-five years of age, and gifted with remarkable powers alike of body and mind.

I well remember how he impressed many of us in those early years. It was an inspiration to listen to him; he spoke with such directness and assurance of faith that his words went home to every heart. My recollections of him chiefly centre around Egremont, but I also remember well his Hope Hall addresses, and his work in Birkenhead. He twice paid visits to my native parish of Borgue, in Kirkcudbrightshire, and conducted a series of meetings in the Free Church there. It never was so crowded in my recollection, and deep and permanent results followed his faithful preaching of the gospel. There are persons still living there who attribute their true conversion to these services. I still remember one sermon of extraordinary power which he preached from the words, "He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son hath not life" (1 John v. 12). His prayers were even more remarkable than his sermons; his intense pleading with God, the holy boldness with which he claimed fulfilment of God's promises, wrought a solemn awe in the congregation. He preached in the surrounding towns, and may be said to have started a revival of religion in those parts.

Yet withal he was a most genial and light-hearted companion. In his intervals of leisure he was almost frolicsome, and no one ever had less of sanctimoniousness. I well remember him vaulting over a gate alongside the Church just before his meeting, to the great dismay of the austere Scotch Presbyterians. He combined naturalness and reality in a most winning manner, and seemed wholly delivered from that bugbear of self-consciousness which oppresses so many good people. His doctrine in these early days was an intense belief in the "finished work of Christ"; on the ground of that he preached a full and immediate salvation. He believed with all his soul that Christ had made a full atonement for sin on the cross, and that "faith in

the Beloved" brought immediate peace and pardon to the sinner. It seemed to me as if he had received a kind of revelation on the subject of Christ's "finished work." I always understood that he traced his own conversion to a sudden flash of light on those dying words of our Saviour, "It is finished," and this was the keynote of his ministry all through his life. He held the old Calvinistic creed with this addition, that he believed in a free salvation offered to all; he drew the line between the saved and the unsaved in every address, and warned the latter that they were under condemnation, and would be eternally lost if they rejected the Saviour. I never remember a deeper feeling of solemn reality than in those early years of his work.

It is not needful for me to dilate on his later work, as you are far more competent than I am to speak of it. I was less associated with him after the sixties. Each of us had a busy life, and we moved in different channels, so that we did not meet so often, except in his autumn holidays, when he often was a visitor at my house. He passed through that process of mind which is common to all men, and became interested in a wider range of subjects. In his later years he was quite as much a pastor as an evangelist, and he showed the same skill as before in dividing the word of truth, and applying the principles of the Bible to all kinds of men and all conditions of life. Those who were accustomed to hear him will testify that few men equalled him in expounding the Word of God. His knowledge of the Scripture was almost unrivalled; he must have been well trained in youth. Like Timothy, "From a child he had known the Holy Scriptures," and this enabled him to start at once a full-fledged theologian when the truth which lay in his mind was vitalized by Divine grace.

His reverence for the Word of God was the foundation alike of his character and his teaching. He was utterly opposed to those rationalistic views which degrade the Bible to a collection of human ethics, partly fabulous and partly true. It was all alike—Old Testament as well as New—a Divine revelation. He heard the voice of God speaking in Genesis as well as in John; the miracles of Moses were as real to him as the miracles of Christ. He treated the Bible as a living organism, instinct with Divine life, the product of the Divine mind, and adapted to man at all stages of his history. Yet he was not what I would call a slavish traditionalist or a slavish literalist. He recognized the laws of historical perspective, and well understood that Divine revelation was a growth and development and had to be interpreted with reference to the age in which it was written and the people to whom it was addressed. His mind was essentially conservative in matters of religion, but he was not what may be called an obscurantist. He watched the progress of thought and criticism, and if he rejected modern Broad Church views it was not because he was ignorant of them, but because he believed they were false.

His religion was experimental as well as biblical. He believed in man's fallen estate because he felt the strength of sin within himself. He believed in Divine grace because it had saved him. He believed in salvation through the blood of Christ because his soul found pardon

and peace through the belief of that truth. The strength of his religion lay in the mixture of faith and experience; he could truly say: "We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen."

Perhaps I may be allowed to glance at some other sides of his character. He was all his life a keen and interested observer of public affairs. He held that a pious citizen was called upon to take his full share in public duties, and not to immure himself in a cloister. His whole conception of religion was the antipodes of sacerdotalism; he hated priestcraft in every form, and viewed with dread the ascendancy of the High Church Party in the National Church. He often expressed to me his alarm at the Romeward movement of English Church life, and this not merely on religious grounds, but on civic as well. He held with all his soul that "the Reformation" was the foundation on which the liberties and greatness of the country were based, and he looked with dread to the obscuration of those great principles.

He was a Radical in politics. He believed in the essential equality of men, and opposed privilege in every form; but he was a loyal subject of Queen Victoria, and had no preference for republicanism over monarchy. He was contented with our institutions, believing that they were capable by adaptation to meet all the necessities of our national life. In the general structure of his mind and character he greatly resembled John Bright; and, like that great tribune of the people, he became more conservative in later years. He parted company with the Liberal Gladstonian Party when their great leader adopted "Home Rule for Ireland," and was a strong opponent of this policy to the end of his life. Had Mr. Lockhart gone into the political arena as his sphere of life, no one can doubt that he would have made his mark. He had astonishing powers of speaking, and an admirable voice, capable of reaching the largest audience, with a command of homely Saxon hardly excelled by John Bright himself. His lucidity of thought and expression was such that no one ever doubted what he meant. He always went straight to the point, was a hard hitter, and almost always carried his audience enthusiastically with him. It is well known that many years ago he might have been the accepted candidate of the Liberal Party in Liverpool, but he wisely chose the better part, and kept his strength for the work to which God had specially called him. The writer would be wanting in generosity if he forgot to add that he owed much to Mr. Lockhart at the time when he entered public life in Liverpool; his counsel and his speeches did much to secure success in that stirring contest.

Mr. Lockhart, like most strong characters, had the defects of his virtues. His intense individuality rather disqualified him from working on joint committees, or in associated enterprises. He was better fitted for personal and individual work, and he got on best with those who submitted to his powerful personality. This led him to tread sometimes on the toes of those who truly loved and admired him, but it was readily forgiven for the sake of his eminent services and perfect honesty. It may be questioned whether such a career as that of Mr.

Lockhart does not require a certain degree of self-assertion ; it may be doubted whether he could have done the work he did had he possessed all the culture and the soft manners of the age. He resembled Mr. Spurgeon in many things ; their type of doctrine was the same, and their refusal to tolerate lax views was identical. Such a constitution of mind involves a life of conflict ; and our friend, like the great London Nonconformist, was often engaged in controversy.

As Mr. Lockhart's figure recedes into the distance, it will stand out more and more distinctly as a remarkable personality. He was a unique man, unlike any I ever knew. He had something of Knox, something of Bunyan, and something of Cromwell. He reproduced much of the heroic type of the seventeenth-century Puritanism. He feared nothing but the face of God ; like a strong man, he ran his race, and he fell in his prime and in the maturity of his powers. He will be sadly missed in this great community to which he had given his life. He will be mourned by many to whom he was a spiritual father ; but surely of few men can these words be more truthfully used : "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith."—From *W. P. Lockhart, Merchant and Preacher.*

Appendix XIV

FREE TRADE *VERSUS* RECIPROCITY

By SAMUEL SMITH

I DESIRE in this pamphlet to deal briefly with the discussion which has been carried on so actively for some time under the name of Reciprocity. The subject is one that has taken hold of the country in no ordinary way, and it is desirable on every account that it should be fully and exhaustively discussed. There can be no doubt that there is a widespread feeling of disappointment, we might almost say indignation, among the manufacturing districts at the treatment which this country has received of late years from foreign nations. The sanguine hopes entertained in the years following the repeal of the Corn Laws that our liberal policy would be generally imitated abroad have been dismally disappointed, and there has been a marked return of late years to an increasingly protective policy on the part of most Continental nations, as well as the great communities on the other side of the Atlantic. We might almost say that there is a settled purpose to shut out British goods from the markets of the leading nations of the world, notwithstanding that we are by far the best customers for their products, and admit them nearly all free of duty into our ports. The period of bad trade which this country has passed through, though greatly mitigated during the past two years, has sown widely the seeds of discontent with our commercial policy, and arguments are reappearing on all sides which it was supposed the free trade controversy of 1840–50 had finally demolished. No doubt many of these arguments are crude reproductions of ancient fallacies, but others cannot fairly be so described, and it is neither wise nor politic to treat them as only deserving of ridicule; the very fact that every leading nation in the world repudiates our existing free trade policy should make our economical authorities more modest in their assertions. The object of this paper is to enquire whether there is any residuum of truth in the mass of popular opinion that has been dignified by the name of "Reciprocity."[1]

But, first, we must ask what is meant by this term. In its plain natural sense it means simply mutual or reciprocal free trade, a consummation which every orthodox economist must ardently desire. Surely there cannot be any one who does not admit that mutual is

better than one-sided free trade. There can be no doubt that in the plain grammatical sense of the words every one is in favour of reciprocity, but a conventional meaning has come to be attached to this term. It is considered that to favour reciprocity means advocating the protection of native industry, or, at least, attempting by means of retaliatory duties to break down foreign tariffs, and so attain to greater freedom of trade. It is only in that latter sense that I consider the question worth serious treatment. I take it for granted that most intelligent men have long given up the opinion that a country like Great Britain can be benefited by protecting either its agriculture or staple manufactures against foreign competition. From one-third to one-half the food of our people is now imported from abroad, and it is plainly of more importance that the masses should have cheap food, than that the agricultural class should have higher prices for their products. It is equally clear, that as Great Britain is the greatest exporter of manufactures, she must continue to be the cheapest producer in order to hold her own against the competition of the world. Any protective duties we could levy which would materially raise the price either of food or manufactures would be a cause of loss, not of gain, to the country at large. The real question that is engaging the attention of men, by no means to be classed among visionaries, is whether we cannot find some appliance to bring pressure to bear upon foreign countries, so that we can make it their own interest to admit our products as freely as we admit theirs.

To form sound opinions upon this point it is needful to put ourselves mentally in the position of foreign nations, who levy heavy import duties for the avowed purpose of protecting native industry, and to ascertain honestly what are the real motives that induce them to follow a course which all our leading authorities have declared to be suicidal. It strikes me that there is great ignorance, and often not a little misrepresentation, of the real motives that actuate such countries as the United States and Canada in following out the policy they have deliberately adopted.

As one who has often argued the point with intelligent Americans in the United States, as well as in this country, I am bound to say that they make out a much better case than is generally supposed here. Speaking broadly, the view which Americans take is that manufacturing industry on a large scale cannot be planted in a new country, mainly inhabited by an agricultural population, without at least a period of protective duties. They hold, and I think justly, that they never could have established vast manufacturing industries in the face of free and open competition with an old and rich country like ours. In colonial days, and up to the war of 1813–14, the United States had few manufactures; they drew their supplies chiefly from Europe, and were mainly an agricultural community, like Australia or New Zealand, but so great was the suffering caused by the war of 1813–14, and so strong a feeling did it create against this country, that it decided them to cultivate home manufactures even at the cost of paying higher prices. This policy has constantly grown since

then, and was enormously stimulated by the Civil War, which made a large revenue necessary, and no way of raising it seemed so easy as to levy it upon foreign goods, and thus, in their opinion, throw a considerable part of the cost of the war upon Europe.

The Americans are perfectly alive to the fact that they pay higher prices than they need do for many kinds of goods in order to build up a system of manufactures, but they argue that they get a full compensation in the great centres of industry that are thereby created, and in the capital and population that are attracted to their country by the profitable employment obtained in those great seats of trade.

It seems clear to me that if the United States had never levied any duties at the custom-house, but adopted *ab initio* a system of absolute and mutual free trade with this country, much of the population and capital that are now employed in Massachusetts and Pennsylvania would have been located in Lancashire, Yorkshire, and our coal and iron regions, producing the goods required by the rural population of America. The United States would have been a vastly magnified Australia or New Zealand, containing a thinly-scattered population and a few large commercial cities on the sea-board; but probably some millions of people would have remained in these islands, and made the goods which the American farmer needed, instead of emigrating and building up the manufacturing towns of New England, Pennsylvania, etc. It is quite true that if we look merely at the interest of the individual and not at that of the nation, it is better that these millions of people emigrated and found a home in the New World than that they should have remained to swell the already too dense population of Great Britain; but nations look at these questions from a different point of view to individuals, and what has been a source of national gain to America has been a cause of national loss to us, and it is vain to expect that this country will view with satisfaction the transfer of its population and capital to America under the operation of their fiscal system.

It may be argued that now that the manufacturing system of America is complete, and suffices to supply almost her whole home consumption, she has no longer any interest to bolster it up, but rather to aim at being a cheaper producer and compete with England in the open markets of the world. No doubt there is force in this view, and it will gradually gain ground in America and lead to a relaxation of her tariff, especially as her rapidly-diminishing debt makes it unnecessary to raise so large a revenue.

The point, however, I wish to insist upon is that the United States, like all new countries, our own colonies included, consider the acquisition of extensive manufacturing industry worth paying a price for, and there is no way in which they can obtain that object in the earlier stages of national growth except by a protective tariff. This motive is so strong, and operates so constantly, that we need never expect to see it disappear, and I have little doubt that when Australia, New Zealand, and our other colonies reach a certain stage of progress they will protect their own manufactures, as Canada is now doing, and

Victoria is beginning to do. It seems to me that some of our economists err in supposing that mankind are to be ruled by no principle except such as can be shown logically to facilitate the acquisition of wealth for the individual. Human nature is a very complex thing, and man is not a mere wealth-producing machine. He is influenced, and justly influenced, by motives that appeal to other parts of his nature than his pocket. The Irish farmer prefers to remain at home rather than emigrate to Manitoba, though he can get 100 acres there more easily than one acre in Ireland. The Irish people, as a whole, would rather have a population of five or six millions in the island, fairly well off, than two or three millions employed in cattle grazing, even though they were much better off. There can be no doubt that pure economical laws as they have usually been expounded in this country would point to Ireland becoming ultimately merely a grazing country, for that form of agriculture yields the best return to the labour and capital employed on the land, and best suits the wet climate of the sister isle; but the Irish people, with very natural patriotism, insist upon rooting the peasantry in the soil, and have constrained Parliament, led by one of our greatest political economists, to pass a measure which flies in the teeth of English notions of political economy.

A few years ago any such measure as that recently passed would have been pronounced absurd by the press of this country, but now it is seen to be a necessity, and the reason is that human nature is affected by many motives besides those that are purely economical. Love of country, of kindred, of religion, are all motives that rightly influence men, and make them willing to sacrifice something of mere gain, and it is the want of perception of this truth which has led many of our commercial authorities to underrate the powerful motives that sway foreign countries, and even our own colonies, in settling their commercial policy. Most of the countries with which we deal are willing to make a slight individual sacrifice to keep a larger population at home, and give them widely varied industries, and thus make them, as they think, self-sufficing.

No doubt it can be clearly shown that if there were no national distinctions, and all the world were of one family and one speech, it would be an immense boon to abolish custom-houses and tariffs, and leave trade to flow in the channels that nature has marked out for it. But seeing that nations possess a strong corporate existence, and national rivalry and even jealousy are still powerful factors in the world, and likely to remain so till the millennium, we cannot expect that great changes of commercial policy will be made merely upon abstract economical grounds; and unless each individual nation sees it to be its plain self-interest to adopt perfect freedom of trade, no amount of admonition or expostulation on our part will avail much.

The action of France at the present time is, perhaps, the strongest stimulant to the reciprocity movement, though she is only following in the wake of Germany, which raised her tariff considerably last year. I think there is less excuse for old and populous countries,

like France and Germany, to lean upon protection than for new countries like the United States. It is fairly open to question whether those countries, with their dense population, cheap and abundant capital, and first-rate technical education, cannot hold their own in many branches of manufacture, as against us in the open field of competition. Undoubtedly, however, the feeling prevails widely on the Continent, that England, with her superior mineral resources, could gradually kill out most of their textile manufactures were there absolute free trade. I am by no means sure that she could not do so in the plainer branches of trade, though probably the French, with their superior taste and climate, could hold their own in the finer goods and articles of taste. Let us suppose for a moment that the Continental view of our manufacturing supremacy is right, and also suppose that Mr. Cobden had convinced all Europe, at the same time that he convinced the British Parliament, that unrestricted free trade was best for the world at large. Under these circumstances we should have seen the gradual transference to this country of nearly all the cotton, woollen, linen and hardware manufactures of Europe. Lancashire and Yorkshire would have profited enormously. The capitalists of Rouen, and Mulhouse, and Liege, and Chemnitz, and other seats of manufacture, would either have lost their capital or transferred it to England; and their operatives would have been dispersed and forced to emigrate. Many, probably, would have had to follow their trade to England. Now all this would be pronounced perfectly orthodox by the writers of political economy: population and capital would be seeking the places where they found the best field of employment and the highest remuneration, and the peasants of France and Germany would buy their goods cheaper when made in England than on their native soil, but the respective nations would lose what the individuals gained. France, Germany, etc., would become weaker and England stronger; and that is fatal in the eyes of most foreigners to the adoption of our theories. You will find that with one consent, all nations prefer to keep their people at home, even in the teeth of economical science. I do not, however, go so far as to affirm that the view held on the Continent about the natural supremacy of British manufacturing power is altogether correct. I am not sure but that the pressure of necessity would so stimulate invention and skill in both France and Germany as to retain many branches of trade even in the field of open competition; still I cannot doubt that England would be the greatest gainer under a system of mutual free trade, and I cannot deny that the fears of their manufacturing classes are in some degree justified. There can be little doubt that backward countries like Russia would have had no manufactures at all, or only the rudest and coarsest kind, had they never adopted protection. England could as surely have prevented their growth as she has that of Irish trade outside of Ulster, or we might add as the north of England has attracted manufacturing industry from the south. Everything, now-a-days, tends to concentrate trade in the centres of population, skilled labour and wealth. The outlying mills in the glens of Lanca-

shire and Yorkshire have nearly all been killed by the competition of the great towns; and this same principle, which makes it hopeless to start new branches of trade in country districts, makes it equally impossible for backward and thinly peopled countries to stand the competition of rich and highly organized ones, except with the help of protection.

No doubt on economical grounds it is better that the highlanders of Scotland should be drawn to Glasgow to find employment, and the Irish of Connaught to the towns of Lancashire—they will produce more, and earn more, than it is possible for them to do in their native valleys—but they have to make the sacrifice of leaving the places and associations they love most, to follow the course of trade, which cuts out for itself channels independent of human taste or preference. In any single nation where there is unrestricted freedom, it will be found that the great industries tend more and more to concentrate at certain spots. We submit to it as to an inevitable law. The same rule would hold good in the great field of the world if there were no frontiers or custom-houses, and looking to the natural advantages that England has from her coal and iron, her humid climate, and energetic population, I can hardly doubt that were the whole world as free from artificial barriers as the different parts of the same nation, many, if not most, of the great trades of the world would concentrate here, and gradually supplant or absorb foreign rivals, as the outlying industries of England and Scotland have been extinguished, or absorbed into the great towns.

This truth is widely perceived in all foreign countries, though rarely alluded to in ours. Our writers confine their attention to the folly of foreigners in paying higher prices than they need if they would take the same articles from us, they overlook the correlative fact that if we can produce cheaper, we should either starve out their trade, or force the foreign capitalists, with their employés, to come over to us and be gradually absorbed into the British nation, as the Huguenots were after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. Whenever matters come to this pass, we may safely predict that national and patriotic considerations will carry the day, and mere economical arguments will go to the winds.

At this point one naturally asks the question is there never a point at which the interest of foreign nations, even from a national and patriotic point of view, is in favour of free trade? I would reply that it becomes their interest when they not only supply their home market but produce a considerable surplus for export abroad. It is the necessity of being a large exporter which makes it the undoubted interest of England to practise and preach free trade, and just as other countries reach that position their policy will also change, and imitate ours. It may be objected that France already occupies that position; it is true she is a large exporter of fine goods and articles of taste, and in regard to them protection does her no good and is unnecessary, but in the commoner articles, such as calico, plain woollens and hardware, it is probable that England would gradually beat her out of

her home market under mutual free trade, and she knows it and fears it, especially as these trades are much heavier and employ much more capital and labour than the manufacture of fancy articles for the rich. No country can be a large exporter of the commoner kinds of manufacture that has a high protective tariff. It keeps her from being a cheap producer; and speaking broadly, a country has to choose between protection and a trade limited to its home market on the one hand, or free trade and the markets of the world on the other. Great Britain has wisely adopted the latter alternative—indeed she has no choice; she could not import food and raw materials from abroad for her teeming population unless she created a great market abroad for her goods which she sent in payment; but if poor and backward countries were to imitate her policy they would not gain the foreign markets, but would probably lose most of their home trade.

We cannot too clearly remember that the position of this country is almost unique among the nations of the earth. Its population is nearly double what it can maintain with home-grown food, and most of the raw materials of its industry have also to be imported. It must of necessity find outlets abroad for its manufactures or else part with its population. It is just in proportion as it can find these outlets that it can continue to grow in wealth and population. Supposing that we had always enjoyed mutual free trade with America, but few of our people need have emigrated. We might have been at this day exporting two or three hundred millions a year of goods to the United States, in place of twenty or thirty, and taking back two or three hundred millions of food and raw materials, in place of eighty to a hundred. Our population might have been forty to fifty millions, in place of thirty-five. There is absolutely no limit to the growth of wealth and population in a country like this, except by the limitation or closing of foreign markets. The degree to which we can send the produce of our labour abroad measures the degree to which we can expand and multiply at home.

Unfortunately nearly every country of importance is fully alive to this, and tries with all its might to prevent that desirable result, and the consequence is that we are thrown increasingly upon the poor undeveloped countries of the world, and our younger colonies for the expansion of our trade. But this is by no means a desperate position. The world is large, a great part of it is poor, undeveloped and semi-civilized, and in these vast regions our trade is constantly growing. India, China, and Japan can absorb almost limitless quantities of goods; indeed nearly the whole of Asia, Africa, South America, and Australia are open to our trade. As we are the cheapest producers we control these great markets. The nations that rely upon protective tariffs cannot touch us. The competition of the United States, which used to be formidable in China, has almost died out since she raised her tariff so much; and Germany, which used to export considerably to the East, has lost that trade, just as she shut us out of her home market, by raising her tariff. This is a world of compen-

sations. No country has unmixed advantages, and as we suffer from the unjust treatment of nations that are politically on an equality with ourselves, we gain an increasing control of the trade of the poorer and dependent part of the world. We have also gained the undisputed control of the carrying trade. Since the introduction of steam, our unrivalled facilities for ship-building and navigation have given us not merely preponderance, but absolute supremacy on the ocean. America, once a close competitor with us for ocean traffic, has entirely lost it since she advanced her tariff, and will never regain it till she adopts free trade. It is some comfort to think that a steady adherence to a liberal commercial policy has brought us many advantages to compensate for the ill treatment we have met at the hands of the stronger nations. So far as one can judge, the course of British trade in the future will be mainly one of expansion with the more backward parts of the world, and contraction with the more highly civilized nations, so far at least as the export of our manufactures is concerned.

This leads me to the point with which this enquiry started. Have we any means of bringing pressure to bear upon those nations which treat us most unjustly? Can we punish them by retaliation, or otherwise, so as to make them lower their tariffs and admit our goods? The gist of the whole reciprocity agitation turns upon this. I would remark here that scant justice is measured out to those who advocate retaliation. It is usually assumed that all they wish, or expect, is simply to forbid the import of really necessary articles from abroad, because the foreigner will not take our goods in exchange; that they wish, for instance, to cut off the food supply which comes from America because America will not take our calicoes. Truly that policy would be like cutting off the nose to spite the cheek, and I never met or heard of any rational man who advocates it. It is therefore a poor way of reasoning to meet the more intelligent advocates of reciprocity by fastening on them an absurdity they entirely disclaim. What able men, such as Mr. Ecroyd, hope to see attained is, to bring temporary pressure upon countries like France which will suffice to make it their interest to adopt either entire or partial free trade. They hold that if we threatened to tax the French woollens silks and laces, and did so in earnest unless they reduced their tariff on our goods, we should create in France so strong an agitation among powerful classes of the community in favour of free trade that it would be adopted. To give effect to this policy it would be needful to adopt it in case of refusal, and perhaps for a term of years to pay a little more for some articles of luxury, and divert some English money into home channels instead of foreign; but the contention is that sooner or later the suffering classes in France would compel their government to capitulate, and then we would enjoy the advantage of full instead of partial free trade.

The opponents of this policy generally confine their attention to the first stage of this process, and decline to look to the second. They enlarge upon the evil—if such it can be called—of making French

goods dearer to the consumer; but they do not reply to the argument that it may be worth paying this price, for a short time, if it effects the end of opening the French markets freely to our goods and thereby benefiting millions of producers. It does seem to me that the wisdom or unwisdom of this policy turns upon its practicability, rather than upon abstract scientific dogmas. We receive from France some forty-two millions' worth of commodities, chiefly luxuries, and (1881) we send her twenty-eight millions of goods, of which sixteen are British products, and represent the subsistence of, perhaps, half a million of people. It seems to us that the addition of a tax on these luxuries, even if it fell partly upon the consumers, who are mostly rich people, would be more than compensated if the French markets were shortly re-opened to our trade.

The difficulty that meets me is more one of practicability and expediency than of the abstract deductions of economical science. I have considerable doubt whether it is possible for this country to adopt a retaliatory policy, with sufficient consistency and firmness, to produce much concession in return. Our whole custom-house arrangements have been so long framed upon the principle of unshaken faith in the efficacy of free trade that it is doubtful if it is expedient to retrace our steps, unless we have much clearer views of what we aim at than are ever likely to be attained in a free country like ours, where every class and party makes itself heard. Foreign nations would pay no respect to mere tinkerings with the tariff for the purpose of annoying them. Any policy adopted to break down their selfishness would need to be firm, resolute, and, if need be, prolonged. All manner of difficult questions would arise as between one country and another. It would be next to impossible to prevent the transhipment of goods, and a discriminating tariff would be found hardly possible. I am bound to say that I have seen no scheme yet proposed that appears really feasible, and it would be a great mistake to adopt a weak, vacillating policy that would rob us of the benefit of consistency without giving solid advantage in return. Besides, we are not labouring under any dangerous decadence of trade.[1] The country is undoubtedly reviving, all the tests of national progress are again becoming satisfactory. We are emerging from a most severe and prolonged crisis, and the arguments in favour of a change of policy which were plausible some years ago, are passing away. Further, any power that we possess to retaliate on foreign nations is restricted to what may be called luxuries, or, at least, not prime necessaries of life, and these are but a small part of our imports. No practical statesman would now propose to tax the food products and raw materials of America, and we therefore cannot touch that nation which, of all others, treats us most harshly.

Upon the whole, I lean to the opinion that unless matters become much worse than they are now, it is not worth while to disturb the policy, at once simple and noble, that we have now followed for a

[1] This was written in 1881, but I am sorry to say that depression has again returned, and most of the leading trades have been very dull during 1883 and 1884.

generation. I venture to express the belief that a time of increased prosperity is at hand—indeed had Providence vouchsafed to us the blessing of a good harvest this year trade would probably have revived in a marked degree—even as matters stand the outlook is not unpromising if the world remains at peace, and patience and perseverance in a straightforward and honest policy will meet its reward.

It may, however, not be amiss for a few moments to take a retrospective glance, and consider what might have been the result of applying the principle of reciprocal free trade to our colonies from their infancy onwards. There was a time with all of them when they entirely depended on the mother country for their supply of manufactured goods. They were at the outset merely agricultural communities, and it may fairly be maintained, as a just political principle, that, in return for the territory this country acquired for them, and the protection afforded them in their earlier stages, they might have been required to enter a national Zollverein, and neither levy duties on British goods, nor have any of their products taxed on arrival here. There was a stage with all our colonies when this would have been gladly agreed to; it may well be doubted whether the bargain would have been kept when the vigorous children attained maturity; but, for argument's sake, suppose such a policy had been practicable, and conceive the magnificent results that would have accrued to the mother country. Our Australian colonies, including New Zealand, at present are mainly dependent upon this country for their supplies of manufactured goods, and, though their population is only a little over two and a half millions, they take nearly as much from us as the United States with their population of fifty millions; in other words, the people of Australia consume about £7 per head of British imports, against 10*s.* per head consumed in the United States. Supposing that the United States had remained a colony, and a part of an Anglo-Saxon Zollverein, it is not absurd to suppose that they should be consuming nearly as much per head of our goods as the people of Australia, located so much further off, now do. If they took even £5 per head, they would receive 250 millions per annum on the present scale of their population, but, unquestionably, had this policy been pursued, a large part of the manufacturing population of the States would have been located in Great Britain. Old England would have stood to them in the same relation which New England now does; their population might have been, say forty millions and ours forty-five, and the additional ten millions of our population would have drawn their subsistence from the American colonists in return for clothing them. This would have been a specimen of the evolution of pure economical laws untouched by political considerations. But, under no conceivable circumstances is it likely that America would have so long repressed the desire for national independence—the dream of an Anglo-Saxon Zollverein never has been, and we fear never will be, realized. But one can readily see how immensely it is for the interest of this country to

retain the trade of the colonies, and if any feasible means could be devised even yet whereby Australia, New Zealand, etc., could be persuaded to remain as good customers as they are now, it would be of first-rate importance.

It seems not unlikely that Australia a hundred years hence may be nearly as populous as the United States now are; supposing, however, it then contains only thirty millions of prosperous people, and that it can be persuaded to follow Free Trade with Great Britain, and also supposing, as would no doubt be the case, that the rougher and more bulky manufactures would gradually spring up there as population increased, even without protection, so that the consumption was reduced to, say £5 per head, our trade would be 150 millions of exports, and no doubt an equivalent amount of imports, say equal to half our entire foreign trade, as at present existing. The only possibility of such a desirable event taking place turns upon Australia having no desire for national independence, and being content to be a part of a great Anglo-Saxon empire. But if, as is not unlikely when she comes to man's estate, she should wish to enter the republic of nations on equal terms, I fear that economical considerations will be outweighed by political. Her statesmen will point out that by a protective tariff she will perforce draw to her shores the population and capital employed in manufacturing for her abroad, and her sheep farmers and gold miners will in all probability tax themselves for some years, as they are already beginning to do, to draw this additional source of wealth and greatness to their country. All questions of this kind we cannot too often remember have two sides, one affecting the individual, the other the State, and what appears to be the interest of the former is not always the interest of the latter.

Let me illustrate by again referring to Australia. Speaking broadly, she has now (1881) two millions of people (not counting New Zealand) mostly agriculturists or gold miners. She produces little except agricultural produce and gold, and what she does not consume she exports to pay for clothing and luxuries. Let us say for argument's sake that she produces in all eighty millions' worth, of which she consumes forty and exports forty to pay for her imports from England and other countries, which are valued at that figure on landing. It is quite clear that if she could draw to her shores the people who produce the forty millions she imports, she would nearly double her population and national wealth. We say *nearly*, for no doubt her first population of farmers and miners would lose something, at least in the earlier stages of building up manufacturing industry, for they would have to pay more than they do at present; they would suffer as the American western farmers do who pay higher prices for iron and calico than they could buy them at from Great Britain; but let it be borne in mind—and this is the crucial point—the State would gain the accession of a manufacturing population of say one to two millions, producing not only the forty millions of goods at present consumed by her agricultural population, but all the additional goods required for their own consumption. The producers of food, instead

of sending their surplus to England to exchange against the goods of Bradford and Manchester, would send it to the new manufacturing centres at home, and the spectacle would be presented of their foreign trade declining while the commonwealth grew in wealth and population. Of course it will be replied that the farmers of Australia would be great fools to tax themselves merely to draw people to their country to make their clothing at a greater cost than England is willing to make it at now, and this argument will have weight with them so long as there is no contrariety of interest between Australia and England. So long as the colony feels towards the mother country as Wales feels towards England, or Lincolnshire feels towards Yorkshire, there is little chance of this policy being acted on. Mr. Mongredien shows conclusively in his admirable little book on free trade how absurd it would be for one part of England to protect itself against another, and he argues that it is equally absurd for one country to protect itself against another, but he fails to perceive, or at least make allowance for the new and weighty considerations that come into play when the interests of the State are concerned. There can be little doubt that if Australia were an independent State she could make herself more strong and populous by attracting a manufacturing population and building up native industries as the United States has done. To revert to my illustration. At the present time Australia supports two millions of people earning, let us say, £40 per head. Under protection she might increase that, let us say to be on the safe side, to three millions earning only £35 per head. I suppose that the extra cost of the native goods amounts to a tax of £5 per head, and that is an enormous allowance, and would only hold good in the earlier years when the system was being fostered, for as soon as the system was built up the immense saving of freight across the ocean, both on the goods and raw produce, would probably counterbalance the extra cost of manufacturing. If we suppose then that the three millions of population earn £35 per head, as against £40 per head earned by two millions at present, the income of the whole State would be 105 millions as against eighty millions at present. I believe this describes in a rough and inexact manner the class of considerations that turns the scale against free trade with most foreign nations. They prefer to have a large aggregate population, and increased national wealth and greatness, to a smaller population and more wealth to the individual. France would, for instance, rather have thirty-six millions of people earning, let us assume, £20 per head, than thirty millions earning say £22 per head. If we could convince her five millions of peasant proprietors that by buying their clothing and tools in England they would save say £2 per head, but at the cost of destroying their manufacturing centres, and forcing the operatives to emigrate to Great Britain or America, they would with one consent say: Keep them at home, and let us pay the extra cost; we would rather have thirty-six millions of people than thirty millions a little better off.

Mr. Mongredien points out the absurdity of Wales building up a

Customs frontier as against England in order to force its people to make pottery at home at a higher cost than they can do in Staffordshire, or calico at a higher cost than they can do in Lancashire; but this is just what Wales would probably do in some measure if she were an independent nation, and what I suspect the sister isle would attempt if she were cut loose from England. I am much surprised that so little weight is allowed to these considerations by our leading economists; they are sufficiently powerful to overrule all the weighty arguments advanced in favour of international free trade; they appeal to some of the strongest feelings of human nature, and it is as foolish to ignore them as for a physician, in prescribing for a disease, to ignore the constitution of his patient.

I would take this opportunity of saying that the maxims of political economy are but lame guides for the statesman when taken *per se*, and without due regard to the other relations that men sustain to each other. I speak as one brought up in the school of Adam Smith and John Stuart Mill, and I venture to surmise that political economy has not yet found its proper place in the scale of sciences. It has yet to be correlated with those others which deal with man as a member of society, as being subject, and rightly subject, to powerful influence on the side of religion, family, and country—legislation that is based upon no higher conception of man than that of a producer or consumer of wealth will signally fail—our economical authorites and their imitators, who are often mere doctrinaires, lecture foreign nations because they do not legislate on pure economical grounds—they often only display their ignorance in doing so—their standpoint is purely insular, and they palm off as universal axioms what are only deductions from our insular experience. Our earlier economists deduced their formulas principally from British experience, and many of these are only true as applied to the set of circumstances that surround ourselves; at least, they need large qualifications and exceptions when applied to other countries. To form correct conclusions all round, this science needs to be looked at, and its problems treated, from many and different standpoints, and I venture to say that, as this process goes on, we shall be less surprised that able and intelligent statesmen in America, France, and Germany demur to some of our dogmas. I would further observe that political economy is far from being an exact science—its formulas are nearly always subject to important limitations, and when they are applied by mere theorists to solve practical problems they often conduct to conclusions the reverse of true. To a knowledge of the science in the abstract there must be added a practical knowledge of business, or, at least, of public affairs, to make a man able to apply its dicta intelligently—it is more like the science of politics, or what has lately come to be called sociology, and those who know it best will apply its formulas with the greatest caution. Some of the current maxims which pass muster as infallible axioms are utterly misleading when applied to the practical problems of commerce—let me refer to one which is constantly quoted, viz., that all trade is barter, and that imports and exports

pay for each other—and to another which one constantly meets with, viz. that an excess of imports is a proof of a wealthy and prosperous nation, and excess of exports of a poor and unprosperous one. Both of these maxims have a certain degree of truth when stated broadly, but are utterly misleading when applied to the commercial phenomena of particular years and particular nations.

I will take leave to illustrate this by reference to the recent experience of British and American trade. For convenience sake I will take the latter first, and examine the sixteen years that have elapsed since the conclusion of their civil war, and divide them into two periods of eight years each. The former was a time of great inflation and extravagant expenditure; the issue of inconvertible paper money caused by the war had produced a fictitious prosperity, and led to heavy imports of European luxuries, while the great cotton crop, the chief article of export, was for several years much reduced. America for these eight years imported in value nearly double what she exported—if the theory that all trade is barter is true, she was lucky in getting 40*s*. worth of goods for every 20*s*. she paid with—and if the further theory that excess of imports is a sign of wealth be true, she was rolling in wealth. But what was the true explanation? She was contracting enormous indebtedness in Europe—she was exporting national bonds, state bonds, railway securities, etc., to the extent of hundreds of millions sterling, and laying a foundation for a time of great suffering and distress—her exports and imports no doubt balanced, but in the same way as the expenditure of a spendthrift, who pays by giving I O U's.

The time came when these debts had to be liquidated—the commercial crisis from 1873–78 exploded the fabric of fictitious prosperity, severe thrift became the order of the day—imports fell off prodigiously, exports largely increased, and showed for several years a heavy surplus; she became a creditor instead of a debtor to Europe, and her bonds and securities flowed back as fast as they went out; only a trifling proportion of the Federal debt is now held in Europe, and much fewer good securities of all kinds than eight years ago; in addition to which she has supplied herself with an ample gold currency. America has in fact been laying the true foundations of national prosperity the past eight years at a wonderful pace. But if we have to go by the formulas I have already referred to, we should have to believe the absurdity that her diminished imports and increased exports were a sign of growing poverty, that she was in fact only getting 10*s*. worth of goods in return for say 20*s*. she was paying to the foreigner.

The commercial history of England the last ten years affords a similar illustration—it may be divided into two sections, that of 1870–73, which were four years of great prosperity, and 1874–79, which were six years of great depression. In the first four our exports and imports, when proper allowances were made for re-export of foreign produce, for freight and for interest on our immense capital invested abroad, left a large annual surplus, as Mr. Mongredien has

admirably shown—indeed out of the great profits of our trade we were investing fresh capital abroad to the extent of about 100 millions annually. No doubt much of that was lent to bankrupt States and lost, but much more was well invested and returns large interest—the country was really prospering. She was not eating or drinking the balance due to her from abroad as she has done since then. Then followed the six years of bad trade. All the figures were reversed—the imports immensely increased, our exports largely fell off—the balance against this country was on the average about sixty millions worse than for the previous four years.

The cause of this was obvious—a succession of bad harvests caused us to import far more food than usual—the foreigner received forty or fifty millions a year more for food than formerly—and instead of taking our goods in return, he raised his tariffs against us, and took less of our goods than before. All the features of our trade became unfavourable, we might almost say alarming, and yet, strange to say, we ought to have been congratulating ourselves on our growing wealth if the formula be accepted that excess of imports is the test of a flourishing country. No doubt there is a measure of truth in that formula in so far as our large investments in former years enabled us to pay for the prodigious amount of food we required, but certainly it would have been a far truer sign of national prosperity if we had imported less, and exported more. The fact is that the trading of a country resembles in many respects the expenditure of a private individual—where we see a large expenditure maintained for many years we conclude justly that there must be a large income to sustain it, but an inflated expenditure for a few years often shows only the recklessness of a spendthrift and is the prelude to bankruptcy, so the large expenditure of the United States on European luxuries in 1865–72 was a bad sign, and heralded the crisis that followed, and the excessive amount of our imports from 1874–80 also showed that this country was in a very unprosperous state.

As I have already mentioned, however, the past year or two the tide has shown signs of turning—our exports increased last year by fully thirty millions, and promise to be larger again this year, and had the harvest turned out well our imports would have fallen off considerably—bad harvests are a dispensation of Providence, and we can only submit to them with patience, but there are other and important respects in which our national wealth might be greatly increased apart from foreign trade altogether. I refer to the excessive and needless waste of energy and resource that this country sustains from the excessive intemperance of a large part of the people. Our average expenditure in alcoholic drinks has been 130 millions sterling annually for several years, and the indirect waste from enfeebled labour, pauperism and crime may not improbably represent fifty millions more. Deduct from that total of 180 millions what the State takes in taxation, say roughly thirty millions, and there remains a tax of 150 millions voluntarily borne by the community, or about the value of half the consumption of food in the United Kingdom. Suppose that

one half of that could be saved by the community, what a vista of prosperity and social improvement would be gained.

Seventy-five millions a year would be added to the expenditure on food, clothing, houses, furniture, etc., or saved for profitable investment. All the unemployed labour in the country might be set in motion, and most of the trades suddenly galvanized into posperity. I have often marvelled that economists have directed so little attention to what is so fundamental to a nation's prosperity. No expansion of our foreign trade that is at all possible would yield so rich a result, and if the same energy was directed to this homely question that is now devoted to visionary attempts to force reciprocity on unwilling nations, far more substantial good would result.

I would add, in conclusion, that my best hopes for the development of our foreign trade depend upon the continuance of international peace. No small part of the heavy tariffs imposed by foreign countries are for the temporary exigencies of war expenditure, and the interest on debts thus created; any great war throws back for many years the tendency towards freer trade; the Civil War in America has probably cost this country hundreds of millions in the vast reduction of our export trade thereby caused. The present action of France is to a large extent the reflex influence of her disastrous war ten years ago, and the huge addition it made to her annual expenditure. Russia has also added to her tariff to meet the cost of the Turkish war, and so all round the compass. No country is so deeply interested in universal peace as we are, and none feels so quickly the disastrous waste of warfare. If a period of prolonged peace now sets in a general reduction of taxes may be expected, and some relaxation of tariffs will come about gradually merely on revenue grounds. This is certain to come about before long in America, for their national debt is being rapidly paid off, and we will share in the prosperity of the United States I may say almost in spite of their protectionist policy.

For these various reasons I have no great fear for the future of this country—the severe lessons of the past six years were necessary and useful; they checked a prodigality and recklessness that were eating out the heart of the nation, and they have prepared the way for valuable social reforms, and will bring about still greater. Our advancement in national wealth has been certainly rapid the past twenty years, and what the country needs is not more wealth, but a wider distribution and better use of it. If the masses of our people had more of the thrift that prevails in France and Germany, and if the accumulation of wealth in London was more fairly spread through the country, there would be no cause to complain.

I must ask pardon in conclusion if I have diverged a little from the strict title of my paper—the subjects alluded to were all more or less allied to it, and whether or not the reader agrees with me, I hope he will allow that an honest attempt has been made to treat the subject candidly, and without any tinge of party or political feeling.

Appendix XV

BRITISH NAVAL SUPREMACY AND MERCHANT CRUISERS

To the Editor of the *Daily Post*

Sir,—The subvention of fast merchant vessels by the Admiralty in order to have them at the disposal of the country in time of war is a question of no small importance, and it is one that does not receive the attention it deserves.

It has been obvious for some time past that the manner in which the country subsidised certain of our fast merchant vessels, though at one time sufficient for all practical purposes, is so no longer.

When the policy of subsidising some of the faster ships of our mercantile marine was initiated some years ago the condition of affairs was this. Almost the whole of the fastest ships in the world were then under the British flag, and as these vessels had a speed and coal endurance far in excess of what any of our cruisers had, it was realized that in time of war these ships would be of great value as auxiliaries to the Navy. By paying to some of the great steamship lines a small annual subsidy for some of their faster ships we attained the right of using these vessels in time of war, and in the case of all new vessels the subsidies were only granted on the condition that they were constructed so as to be to the greatest possible degree efficient for purposes of war.

A determined effort has been made for some years past by the principal foreign countries to wrest from us our supremacy in the fastest type of ocean steamships. With this object in view, such countries as France, Russia, Germany and America inaugurated a system of very heavy subsidies in order to create a fleet of vessels of the very fastest type for use in time of war. In spite of this, for some time this country maintained a preponderance in fast ships almost as great as it has in slower ships, but by a constant increase of their subsidies they have at length overtaken us, and, if matters continue as they are doing, they will end by almost crushing us out.

In each particular period considered only the vessels of the very maximum speed, and those that come within two or three knots of that speed, are included, as the vessels which form this class have always a value for naval purposes far and away above what slower vessels have.

It will be found that about 1880–1 almost all the vessels in the world of this type alluded to were under the British flag. In 1885 a

third of such vessels were under foreign flags, but in our two-thirds were included all the ships standing at the very top of the class. In 1889 of these very fast ships there are almost as many foreign owned as British owned.

Looking at the figures this year, including all the vessels with speeds from 19 to 22 knots, there are about fourteen foreign ships to six British, and several countries taken alone are almost level with us, while, with the exception of two vessels, they have among theirs quite as large a proportion as we have of the ships which are among the very fastest of all. But the most discouraging point is that the tendency seems for matters to get much worse. Ships of the fastest type are confined almost entirely to the Atlantic trade, as nowhere else can a sufficient number of passengers be got to compensate for their excessive coal consumption, and small cargo carrying capacity. Some years ago there were practically five great Atlantic steamship companies of the first class keeping up a regular service and owned in this country. These were the Cunard, White Star, Inman and Guion lines, while a fifth was made up by the Anchor and National lines combined. Of these only the first two now remain, the rest having either been transferred to foreign flags, wound up, or ceased to exist as express lines, and no new lines have risen to take the place of those that are gone. This country has, therefore, practically only two lines left—the Cunard and White Star—from which to draw vessels of the very fastest type, and the future of these two lines as express lines is not very bright. The Cunard line, in order to hold its own against the competition of the foreign lines, two or three years ago built two ships of great speed, but since these ships were completed, not only has the line paid no dividend, but has run at a loss. The White Star line has only two ships which come up to modern requirements as regards speed, and half its service is carried on by old and comparatively slow vessels. In consequence of this it is hardly able to hold its own as an express line, yet under present circumstances it seems unable to see its way to take the steps necessary to provide a service equal to that provided by the foreign transatlantic lines. While our lines have thus decreased in number, and those left are in the position just stated, the number of great Atlantic lines which are foreign has increased from two to four, and, moreover, to still further improve their position, the North German Lloyd Line is building two new vessels of the very fastest type, while the Compagnie General Transatlantique and American line are both talking of adding to their express fleets. If Canada is successful in getting this country to help her to establish a new line of fast steamships between the two countries, it may for a while prevent our position from getting relatively worse. Any assistance we give to Canada in this matter will, however, unfortunately not form part of an all-round scheme for endeavouring to increase the number of our fast ships, but it will be done rather with the object of establishing closer relations with the colony, and the tendency will be for these new ships to be brought

into existence at the expense of the present ones, and thus in the end to leave us much in the same position as we are in now.

The question, therefore, is can this country afford not only to lose her supremacy in the fastest type of ocean steamships, but end by possibly losing altogether her vessels of this class? Consider what our position is. The mercantile tonnage of the British Empire is eleven times as large as that of France, and between four and five times as large as that of the two countries with the largest mercantile marines taken together; and it is considerably greater than that of France, Russia, Germany, Austro-Hungary, Italy, Spain, Turkey, Holland, Portugal, Denmark, Greece, Belgium, and Norway and Sweden combined. One of the most difficult duties for us in time of war will be the protection of this vast commerce. A *Times* correspondent recently put this matter clearly:—"It is vitally important," he says, "that the special condition on which the future of the Empire depends should never be forgotten or obscured for one moment. That future will be determined by the power to defend our commerce which is evinced in the first great war in which we engage. . . . The teaching of history is clear and unmistakable, as Professor Seeley has so well shown . . . As the grandeur of Spain faded away from impotence to hold her own upon the high seas, so assuredly must the far greater empire of Great Britain crumble into dust if ever the power of defending her commerce is found wanting. That must be placed beyond the shadow of a doubt." The same fact is emphasized by Lord Brassey:—"This empire is connected by ocean roads alone. Unless these roads can be preserved practically inviolate, the whole fabric will inevitably dissolve."

This vulnerability as regards our commerce is thoroughly realized abroad. M. Gabriel Charmes says:—"There are a few trade routes along which passes the wealth of the world, and on which is developed the very life of that immense world-wide British Empire. These routes to some extent correspond to the arteries. They are five or six, at the most ten. It would be an easy matter to scour them continually. A warfare directed against the commerce of an enemy has its rules, and we must have the courage to formulate them—mercilessly attack the weak, without shame fly before the strong." Admiral Aube, a late French Minister of Marine, insists that the policy of France against an enemy must be to send to the bottom every merchant vessel they can, "with cargo, crew and passengers, not only without remorse, but proud of the achievement." The present Minister of Marine in France also belongs to that school which holds that the most effective way of weakening this country in time of war is by organized attacks on its commerce. Those who are in the habit of looking at the annual "Report of the Secretary of the United States Navy" know the great stress laid on the importance of making preparations for attacks on an enemy's commerce and "inflicting the most serious and lasting injury thereby."

The object of our large fleet of British cruisers is to protect our

commerce to as great a degree as possible from the depredations of similar ships belonging to foreign navies. Whether the navy will be able to effectively carry out this task is a question that does not come within the scope of this letter. Owing, however, to this country's losing the bulk of the fastest ocean-going merchant vessels of the world, there is another question raised, and it is one that must be faced. At any time one chooses to take, it will be found that there are certain qualities which the fastest mercantile vessels possess which no sea-going men-of-war have. They have a coal endurance, or, in other words, a radius of action much superior to war vessels, and, what is more important still, they have a speed considerably in excess of what the latter class of vessels have. The advantage that ocean liners have as regards speed is not, perhaps, always realized as fully as it should be, owing to the character of ships' trials belonging to the navy being so different from that of vessels of the mercantile marine, and also because the Admiralty methods of statement as regards ships' speeds are not only confusing, but to a large extent misleading.

Fast armed merchant vessels, therefore, are in this position. They have a speed which enables them to escape from every sea-going man-of-war, and to overhaul practically every merchant vessel afloat, while their armament, though not sufficient to cope with men-of-war, from which they can escape, is sufficient to destroy merchant vessels, which they can always catch, and their coal endurance is so great that they can steam for long periods and over great distances without calling at any port. It is our vessels of this type that are disappearing. It is true that this country quite holds her own in liners of the second rank as regards speed, vessels such as the *Scot* and *Norman*, of the Union Line, the *Dunottar Castle* and *Tantallon Castle*, of the Castle Line, the *Ophir* and *Ormuz*, of the Orient Line, the *Nile* and *Danube*, of the Royal Mail Packet, the *Australia*, *Himalaya* and *Caledonia*, of the P. & O. Line, etc.; but these ships have not a speed sufficient either to escape from cruisers or to overhaul the armed merchant cruisers of foreign countries.

The grave danger of the fastest type of merchant vessels getting more and more into the hands of foreign Powers is obvious. Such ships have their guns lying at their respective ports all ready to mount at a few hours' notice, and it is not pleasant to contemplate the effect of vessels of this kind let loose to prey on our commerce. In the case of the American Civil war the Northern States had an overwhelming naval force at their command, and held the supremacy of the sea. The Confederate States had a few comparatively weak, unarmoured vessels, quite unable to stand up against the ships belonging to the Navy of the North. They had, however, a speed slightly in excess of the ships of the Northern Navy, which enabled them to keep out of their way, and these few ships were able to sweep the commerce of the North off the seas. Admiral Porter, in giving evidence before the Committee of Congress after the war, stated that if the North had owned a few fast merchant vessels, they would have been twice as efficient as the entire Northern Navy, because none of the ships of that navy were able to catch the Confederate ships,

preying on the commerce of the North. The Secretary of the United States Navy a year or two ago vividly pointed out how a few weak ships, which could not be caught, reduced during the war the registered tonnage of the United States Mercantile Marine from 2,640,000 tons to 1,492,000, from which decline it has never recovered. A modern liner would have destructive powers as regards an enemy's commerce, in excess of a vessel such as the Alabama.

Both vessels are alike in their ability to keep out of the way of hostile men-of-war, but the Alabama type of ship had a speed so slightly in excess of the ordinary merchantman, that to overtake it was a very lengthy process, and by no means certain. The speed of the ordinary merchantman has hardly increased since that date, whereas the speed of the liner is enormously greater than that of the Alabama, and her power of destruction is thus largely augmented.

The facts of the case then are these :—

1. That this country has lost her supremacy in the fastest type of ocean steamship, and that the tendency seems to be for these vessels to get entirely into the hands of foreign countries.

2. That such vessels have qualities which place them almost entirely outside the sphere of action of men-of-war.

3. That for a country in the unique position we are in, such a state of things constitutes a grave danger.

There seem but two ways out of the difficulty : either we must create a fleet of cruisers capable of overtaking the fastest type of mercantile steamships, or we must have the large bulk of the fastest merchant vessels ourselves, i.e., sufficient numbers to sweep off the seas the vessels of a similar type belonging to an enemy or enemies.

The task of building cruisers of sufficient speed for the purpose seems almost hopeless. Time after time, type after type of cruisers has been built, and in almost every case the sea speed has not come up to the expectations of the Admiralty, and the cruisers cannot steam at sea at anything like the speed of the fastest merchant vessels.

The soundest policy would seem to be to rely on armed merchant cruisers of our own to protect us from the depredations of similar vessels belonging to an enemy. As supremacy of the sea means national existence to us, it is an axiom that this country must have a fleet of battleships sufficient to cope with any fleet or fleets of battle ships that may be brought against us.

But however overwhelming our force of battle ships might be, it alone would fail to secure that supremacy which is vital to us. It is necessary to maintain, irrespective of what our ratio of battle ships is to other powers, a force of cruisers sufficient to clear the seas of hostile cruisers, as they possess qualities which place them outside the sphere of action of battle ships. And as cruisers are without the sphere of action of battle ships, so in the same manner are fast armed merchant vessels outside the sphere of action of cruisers, and so it behoves us to have a fleet of merchant-cruisers sufficient, should it be necessary, to sweep off the seas the fleets of armed merchant cruisers which have lately come into existence in other countries.

What is needed to save our high speed merchant vessels is a system of subsidies both more generous and more methodical than those which now exist. For a sum of money which would form an almost inappreciable part of the Navy estimates, we could entirely alter the present unsatisfactory position of affairs. The Admiralty at present pay several of our fastest merchant ships subsidies which vary from £2,500 to £7,500 per annum. In return for these subsidies the ships have to be built according to Admiralty requirements, and the Government have besides the right of pre-emption for these ships. The subsidies are not guaranteed for any fixed time, and the Admiralty can cancel them at any moment, and in some cases have done this. It has been seen how the enormous subsidies granted by foreign countries to their fast ships have made it impossible for us to compete successfully, and the subsidies of the nature granted by our Admiralty seem insufficient to induce British shipowners to continue competing.

It would not be necessary to grant subsidies anything like as large as are granted by foreign Governments to their fast ships in order to regain our supremacy. There are certain routes where, owing to the extent and nature of the traffic, all the fastest ships naturally run. Conditions being equal, we would have an overwhelming superiority of ships on these routes; but the excessive amount of subsidies paid by foreign countries has at length given them a slight advantage, but it is sufficient to bring about the disastrous results pointed out. If we raised British subsidies to £10,000 or £15,000 per ship, guaranteed them for ten or twelve years, and gave them to all ships built above a certain speed, this would probably be sufficient to save a most valuable class of ships to us. In discussing subventions one word must be said with regard to the new fast line of steamers, which it is proposed to establish between Canada and England, and about which so much is being heard. A line like this can only be brought into existence by means of an enormous subsidy, and the subsidy has to be so large because we are making fast ships run on a route where the conditions of trade make it exceedingly difficult for such a type of ships to exist. It is as if we try and force the water of a stream up hill instead of simply helping it to run better along a natural watercourse, by removing obstructions which have been placed in the way. The enormous bulk of this proposed subsidy goes not simply to obtain fast ships, but to obtain fast ships on a route very unpropitious for such ships running. Whether the advantages derived from improved intercourse between Canada and the mother-country are commensurate with the very large expenditure necessary seems doubtful.

That however does not concern us here. What it is desired to point out is that this proposed subsidy is colonial and not naval, and though it will give us four more fast ships, if nothing else is done, it will only increase the pressure which is squeezing out our other fast ships, and there will be little or no benefit in the end. The only effective plan is to have a regular system of subsidising all our fast ships, and even if it were necessary to pay a slightly larger sum than that mentioned above, it would surely be money well spent. We should be absolutely certain

that the ships we get would have the speed necessary and the only expense the country would undergo would be this small amount per annum on a few ships. Even if it were possible to build cruisers able to overtake the mercantile cruisers of an enemy the cost would be half to three-quarters of a million pounds per ship, with repairs each per annum costing as much or more than the total subsidy of a merchant cruiser, not to speak of the enormous cost of coal, wages of crew, etc., which expenses would go on in time of peace.

Do not let us continue our present short-sighted policy, but, recognizing that our fastest type of ocean steamships are being crushed out, determine before it is too late to subsidise on more liberal terms all steamships built over a certain speed. This policy is not advocated to preserve a decaying branch of a trade, but in order to have a fleet of vessels for auxiliaries to the Navy in time of war, that will be able to carry out certain duties, which the Navy is unable to undertake. This object can be attained more effectively and far more cheaply by increasing the number of our fast mercantile ships than in any other way. The duties are those which a country like this, the centre of a world-wide empire joined together by ocean highways, a country with a commerce on the sea as great as all the world combined, must be able to undertake.

Yours, etc.,

J. GORDON SMITH.

May 16, 1896.

Appendix XVI

SPEECH ON THE EVILS OF THE STREETS OF LONDON

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
Friday, July 13, 1900.

MR. SAMUEL SMITH : I venture to bring to the attention of the House a very painful subject, but one of urgent public importance. I ask its indulgence while I lay before it some special evils that are eating into the heart of our national life. The State has spent immense sums in primary education, and the children are much better educated than they were a generation ago ; but, I ask the House, what is the education they get on the streets of the Metropolis when they leave school and reach that susceptible age when character is formed ? The centre of the Metropolis is given up to a carnival of vice every night, and I doubt whether in the whole civilized world such open and hideous manifestation of vice is to be seen as may be witnessed in Piccadilly, Regent Circus, and the adjacent streets.

Let me read to the House a letter I have received from one much respected, whose name is widely known and honoured. I refer to Bishop Barry, whose church and rectory are in Piccadilly :

> I am anxious not to exaggerate : but it is difficult to speak too strongly as to the state of things which is there allowed to exist especially between the hours of 11 p.m. and 2 a.m. The nefarious traffic in vice is carried on unblushingly by those who are well known to the police as prostitutes, or as living on the wages of prostitution. Solicitation, especially of the young, is openly practised, sometimes almost to violence. It is all but impossible to walk down Piccadilly at that time without molestation. Rows of cabs stand along the streets, to be hired for conveyance to immoral houses. At times there is open disorder of hustling, shouting and rowdyism in general, mostly under the influence of strong drink. Formal complaint has to be made before this is sufficiently checked by the police. We feel the condition deeply as a grievance and a scandal. We do not of course expect that sensual vice can be eradicated by action of law. But we do think that the constant and flagrant exhibition of vice in our streets and the presentation of dangerous temptation to the inexperienced ought to be prevented ; and in this we only claim for the Metropolis what is already secured in some of our largest provincial cities.

Permit me to read another letter from a friend of mine who works among young men and has exceptional opportunities of knowing the state of London :

I understand that to-morrow evening you purpose to call the attention of the House of Commons to the way in which prostitution and solicitation is allowed to prevail in the streets of the Metropolis.

For sixteen years I have been engaged in work amongst young men in the centre of London, and I have come to the conclusion, after a long experience, that thousands of young men who yearly fall into immoral practices in the Metropolis do so because the temptation meets them at every street corner. It is not once or twice in the course of a walk that a man is solicited for immoral practices; but the principal streets in the centre of London are thronged with fallen women, who in the present day seem to be allowed to carry on their vile business without any restraint whatever. That this is a growing evil is evident from the way in which it has developed in recent years. Ten years ago it was a very uncommon thing for a man to be solicited in the City itself during the daytime, but this is now a matter of frequent occurrence in Ludgate Hill, St. Paul's Churchyard and Cheapside, while what I think is an equally marked evidence of the spread of this evil is the way in which our suburban roads are now used for the purposes of prostitution. I know from personal experience that even at a distance of eight miles from London, in a very quiet suburb, three or four women are constantly walking up and down in the neighbourhood of the station, soliciting men returning to their homes from business, and I am told that this is true, not only in the west of London, but also in the north. . . .

As a citizen of London I do feel that we have a right to demand that what has been done in Glasgow, Liverpool and Manchester should be done in London, and that the streets should be cleared of this tremendous evil.

There is, however, another aspect of this question which equally deserves attention, and that is the tremendous growth during the past ten years in the issue of publications in which pictures of an exceedingly indecent character are constantly to be found, and I also think that some attention should be given to the fact that the exhibition of grossly obscene pictures in business establishments can be carried on with impunity. I have myself appealed to a London magistrate on this question, and have shown to him copies of publications purchased for sixpence, each of which contained sixteen pictures of women in a nude condition, calculated to have an exceedingly injurious effect on the minds of young men, and I was assured by the magistrate that as the law stood at present it was impossible to proceed.

Trusting that your efforts may meet with much success, and that a blow may be struck at what is, I believe, England's greatest enemy, etc., etc.

I have also received the following letter from Rev. Hugh Price Hughes, of the West London Mission :—

8, Taviton Street,
Gordon Square, W.C.,
May 22, 1900.

Dear Mr. Samuel Smith,—I greatly regret that overwork has prevented me from writing to you before now to say how thankful those of us who live and work in West Central London are that you are about to bring the condition of our streets, especially in the neighbourhood of Piccadilly Circus, under the notice of Parliament. From an exceptional knowledge of the social evil during the last thirty years I have long realized that while the vice itself can be removed only by moral and Christian influences, the deliberately organized trade in vice ought to be attacked by public authority. There is no doubt that in some respects the condition of our streets is growing worse, especially in consequence of the great increase of foreign tradesmen in vice and foreign women. There is no difficulty whatever owing to recent legisla-

tion in dealing with disorderly houses and disorderly clubs when the local authorities are willing to do their duty. The special difficulty in West London arises mainly from two lamentable facts. First, that the existing law with respect to solicitation is so grossly unjust; solicitation by a woman is a crime, but solicitation by a man is no crime at all. Those of us who know the facts are aware that the great majority of fallen women are the victims of weakness and hunger and misplaced affection and moral weakness, only a small minority are deliberately vicious. That these poor wretches alone should suffer, while their betrayers and tempters go scot-free, is outrageous. And many of us feel an almost insuperable difficulty in taking steps against the victim, while the principal offender is positively encouraged by the existing law. Secondly, Greater London is in the unhappy condition of having no control over its own police, so that when the local police make any mistake, as was illustrated in the Cass case, it becomes at once a question of party politics. You know how admirably the local authorities have dealt with this evil at Sheffield, Glasgow and elsewhere, but there municipal government is not mixed up with Imperial party politics, and the best citizens of all shades of opinion give their moral support to the police, which alone makes police action safe and effective. Until we can eliminate this element of party politics and the desire of the Government of the hour to save the skin of the Home Secretary, we cannot do much. There is one thing, however, that could be done at once, and it would have an immense effect. The ever-growing multitude of well-known foreign women may be sent home. No foreigner has any right whatever to come to this country for the mere purpose of breaking the law and promoting vice.

Yours very sincerely,

H. P. HUGHES.

It is true that matters have been growing worse in London of late years. This nuisance was once unknown in the suburbs: now it has spread in all directions, especially where there are theatres; and it infests the public parks, except those under the control of the County Council, where far better order is maintained.

I have travelled in many countries, but I have never seen such open incitements to vice as you see in London; and surely the time has come to attempt a reformation.

This terrible nuisance has been successfully grappled with in our northern cities, which are far freer from it than they were twenty or thirty years ago. There has been a wonderful improvement in my lifetime in Liverpool owing to the action of the police, directed by a reforming watch committee. In Glasgow I am told that indecency and solicitations by either men or women have almost quite vanished from the streets. The Chief Constable writes me as follows:—

GLASGOW, *May* 2, 1900.

SIR,—I am directed by the Lord Provost to forward to you returns showing the number of prostitutes apprehended during the last two years, in this city, for importuning passengers, and how they are disposed of. The Lord Provost has also asked me to explain to you the method adopted here in dealing with such cases, and I have pleasure in stating to you that we have no difficulty whatever in securing convictions against such offenders, as we are very well supported by the magistrates.

Constables of experience, who know these females well, are sent out every evening in plain clothes to follow these females, and they have instructions to arrest them and convey them to the Office when they are observed importuning. The constables are enjoined to be exceedingly careful, and not on any account to interfere with any female unless she is well known to them as a prostitute.

The same constables have also instructions to watch for, and if possible detect, men molesting females.

These plain clothes constables go on duty every evening at eight o'clock, and in the winter months constables are put along with detectives, from 5 p.m., to watch offenders of the kind referred to.

If there is any other information you desire, I shall be pleased to let you have it.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

(Signed), J. BOYD,
Chief Constable.

I have received the following from the Head Constable of Cardiff :—

CARDIFF,
May 21, 1900.

SIR,—In reply to your letter of the 17th inst., respecting disorderly houses, etc., I beg to inform you that the police of this town have for the past ten years energetically enforced the law and have been fairly successful in suppressing immoral conduct in the streets. When a disorderly house comes under the notice of a constable steps are at once taken to have it watched, and when sufficient evidence has been obtained a warrant is issued and the offenders brought to justice. If a conviction follows, the owner or agent of the property is sent an official notice, and if a second conviction is obtained against the same tenant the owner or agent is prosecuted. We have had several cases of this kind against owners of disorderly houses with the most beneficial results, but, as you may imagine, it is difficult to hit the owner.

Prostitutes plying their calling in the public streets are arrested by the police and dealt with under the Town's Police Clauses Act for importuning passengers.

Prosecutions, however, do not always succeed in suppressing disorderly houses, as the following account will show :—

A certain district of the town was up to about two years ago a very hotbed of vice and disorderly houses, and although prosecution followed prosecution it seemed impossible to rid the neighbourhood of objectionable characters, and the difficulty was the greater consequent on the district in question being in the centre of the town and in the midst of many licensed houses. These, as may be imagined, were frequented by the people of this district, and in many cases proved meeting places for them. It was then decided to adopt special police measures to purify the place. These measures consisted of placing on duty at each end of each street a uniformed police constable, to observe each house and those who frequented it. The result was that in about a fortnight's time the occupiers vacated their houses, and within three months there was not a single disorderly house in the district. These houses are now tenanted by respectable working men.

With regard to establishments carried on under the guise of massage, we have no houses of this description in Cardiff.

The circulation of objectionable illustrated literature in Cardiff has been of rare occurrence, but whenever anything of the sort has been attempted prompt measures have been taken. Only recently indecent mutoscopic prints were seized and ordered to be destroyed by the justices, and the offender was subsequently indicted at the Cardiff Borough Quarter Sessions for misdemeanour and convicted.

The only way to stamp out vice and crime of this character is by energetic police measures combined with a rigorous administration of the law, and even then where the evil is deep rooted it is difficult to suppress it.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

(Signed) H. McKENZIE,
Head Constable.

By means such as these, Manchester, Sheffield, Cardiff, Liverpool, and many other cities, are wonderfully changed for the better of late years. Disorderly houses have been suppressed to an amazing extent by putting the law in force. I see that in Glasgow and Manchester hardly any are known to the police. I remember when tacit toleration was the rule in these cities, and matters were nearly as bad as in London, and the greatest opposition was made to a change of policy. We were nauseated by the cry: "You cannot make men moral by Act of Parliament, and if you banish vice from one quarter it will only go to another." But the citizens saw through the sham excuses for doing nothing, and insisted on the discouragement of open vice. The result is, that far fewer temptations beset the path of youth in our great commercial cities.

How is it that in London an opposite policy is pursued? I cannot forbear saying that the main reason is that the police force is not under local control, but is a quasi-military body under the Home Office. It follows that any unpopularity incurred by the police is at once reflected on the Government. I know that the present Home Secretary is most anxious to abate these evils, but he is fettered by the traditions of the office. The police authorities cannot forget the Miss Cass case, where the mistake of a single constable was made to issue to the discredit of the Government of the day. I thought at the time it was very unjust to use a chance mistake against the Government, but the effect was to put an end to all police action bearing on this evil; and so it will be, I fear, while this system of managing the police continues.

What I would propose would be that the County Council or the new municipal bodies should be authorized to employ a body of inspectors who should go in plain clothes, as in Glasgow, and be confined to dealing with this evil and related evils, such as vile pictures, illustrated papers, books and advertisements. I believe this policy steadily pursued would make a revolution in the Metropolis in a few years. We cannot shut our eyes to the risk that men so employed may be often tempted by heavy bribes to shut their eyes to what is going on. They also are tempted to levy blackmail on innocent women, and to ignore the offences of men against women, which should be repressed and punished just as firmly as those by the weaker sex. There are villains who make it a business to molest and insult innocent women; these scoundrels should be arrested and severely punished.

I will read the House the experiences of a well-known lady-worker in social reform:

> Within the last three or four years I have myself been annoyed by being joined and spoken to (old as I am) in full early afternoon light on the pavement by the Polytechnic. Another time, longer ago, I was waiting a few minutes for my husband in Lincoln's Inn Fields, he having gone into an office, and could scarcely get rid of the man who spoke to me. I hope one lady will tell you of a man coming up to her on a wet day, and getting his head under her umbrella and terrifying her.
>
> I do not hope even to make you realize how terrifying these experiences are to even mature women. When I was superintending a College for Working Women in London, in a Northern Square (Evening Classes), girls used to come in panting and up-

set by their experiences in coming for their desired teaching. They were hardworking girls who were trying to improve themselves after their day's work—not giddy people. In that same neighbourhood a bad man at one time made himself a general terror, but a brave solicitor tackled him and drove him off.

A young lady doctor going home from a midwifery case was insolently joined by a man. Happily she saw a policeman, and had the wit to tell the policeman that the man needed protection as he was frightened of walking alone so late at night. The sarcasm rid her of the annoyance.

I have twice been roughly spoken to by police when in the streets at night, once when looking for a girl who was lost, and once when helping a rescue worker. This is only relative as showing that the police are prone to take the bad character of women who are out at night very easily for granted. Of course this ought not to be so. And I fear an increase of this tendency of mind. I hope that a story will be sent to you of a quite ideally quiet and good young lady, who helped her mother in a domestic emergency by taking a little brother out in a perambulator. She was joined by a man, and walked through square after square till she was quite exhausted, in the endeavour to rid herself of his company without showing him where she lived.

I also hope that you will hear details of a story of a girl sent by her mistress, during daytime, to the post-office, spoken to by a man, followed home, written to. In this case the girl told her mistress, and the man successfully made sorry for his evil conduct.

This work requires men of tried and tested character above the class of ordinary constables, and with higher pay, and should be under the control of a popularly elected body amenable to their constituents; so the public would have a quick remedy if any tyranny were attempted.

I would also call the attention of the House to an intolerable evil that has grown up alongside of the one to which I have been alluding; I mean low illustrated papers full of indecent pictures. These are largely circulated among boys. I cannot conceive of anything more fitted to debauch the minds of the young. It seems almost a mockery to talk about giving them religious education, and then allow this disgusting trash to be placed in their hands.

I carried through the House twelve years ago a resolution to this effect:

> That this House deplores the rapid spread of demoralizing literature in this country, and is of opinion that the law against obscene publications and indecent pictures and prints should be vigorously enforced, and, if necessary, strengthened.

It had a wonderful effect in quickening the action of police authorities, and led to prosecutions all over Great Britain, and convictions were obtained with ease which could not be obtained before. An immense quantity of the rubbish was destroyed, and some of the chief offenders fled the country.

But the evil has re-appeared in a worse form of late years. Photography is far more employed than it used to be. It is much easier to produce cheap illustrations; and there are villains who scour the picture galleries of Europe to collect the worst garbage, and reproduce them in cheap forms for English circulation. One of these vile publishers offers twenty-four of such pictures for *6d.*, and this is advertised in the cheap papers sold to boys and girls.

It surprises me that London Magistrates refuse to convict in such cases. The Home Secretary has seen some pictures which were brought before the Lord Mayor and which he refused to proceed against. The silly argument is used that they are works of art. "Art" is used as a kind of charm. It reminds me of the way the Dublin Invincibles disguised the crime of murder by calling it "removal." They talked of "removing" Lord Frederick Cavendish and Mr. Burke, and seemed to think this took it out of the category of murder. So some sapient magistrates think that if you call the most lewd picture a work of art it becomes sacrosanct. There is a widespread opinion that the Ten Commandments do not apply to Art or the Drama. I do not think this House or the nation will endorse this opinion.

I cannot doubt that if this House will support this motion it will have the same effect as twelve years ago. The Magistracy will feel that the public will back them up to suppress gross incentives to vice. Germany and the United States are moving in this direction. All modern countries suffer from a plague of obscenity. All are finding out that one half the good of education is thrown to the winds by those pests of society who thrive under our laws, which allow too much liberty. England, as the freest country, receives miscreants who are deported from the Continent. The worst class of prostitution is carried on by foreign women, who pour into London accompanied by men who live on their earnings. The Home Secretary has recently passed an Act which strikes at these men, but I am told they have discovered some flaw which enables them to circumvent it. It is this class which circulates the vilest pictures in collusion with foreign publishers, and in any country but ours they would be deported.

Related to this trade in obscene pictures is the great abuse of animated pictures. This wonderful discovery can be utilized to give rational and innocent entertainment, and usually is; but it is also used by ruffians to debauch the young. In my constituency, last year, we discovered some "penny-in-the-slot" machines which exhibited grossly indecent pictures to boys and girls, and I had many letters complaining of this plague from seaside resorts. Now I am told that many parts of London are plagued with it. I quote from a reliable observer:—

I visited the ——— at ——— on Friday, June 29. Many "animated pictures," "mutoscopic views," or "moving pictures" are on view there in various parts of the grounds and buildings, all exhibited by means of "penny-in-the-slot" machines. The first set of machines I visited were advertised to contain "mutoscopic" views, and a number were labelled with suggestive titles. I put a penny in one machine and found that it contained a series of pictures of girls in short frocks, engaged at kicking at a hat which was held above their heads, there being at each attempt a liberal display of underclothing. In another machine of this set, labelled "The Spider and the Fly," views were exhibited showing a woman in tights, sitting in the centre of an imitation spider's web, and inviting a young man to come to her. He resists at first; but in the last view rushes forward evidently to embrace her. There were many other views with suggestive titles. One which I saw was called "Mixed Bathing Allowed," and represented women in scanty bathing costumes playing on the beach.

I visited another set of machines not labelled "mutoscopic." These pictures were the worst I have seen. One set was entitled "Behind the Scenes of a Paris Theatre," and consisted of thirteen pictures, which I saw. All of these pictures were objectionable, and many were indecent. One was the picture of a perfectly nude female; another represented a girl undressing in a bedroom; a third, a girl with nothing on but a thin undergarment; and many were pictures of the lowest kind of French dancers in indecent and suggestive attitudes.

I may add that the attendants at many of these machines are girls.

Scoundrels take an empty shop in a populous thoroughfare and fit up their machines with such pictures, putting suggestive headings in the windows, and a crowd of children are enticed within and gradually brutalized by the disgusting sights they witness. In a primitive state of society these men would be lynched, but here they are allowed to do as they like.

Is it not the case that we need a body of inspectors to deal with such abominations? They will never be suppressed otherwise; and local bodies should be allowed discretion to determine what kind of sights should be suppressed. They are really the guardians of an immense mass of childhood which gets its chief education in the streets. It is ridiculous to require each particular picture to be the subject of a solemn prosecution at a police court, and to let all depend upon whether the magistrate is a man of strict or lax views.

These cases are argued as if it were solely the question of the freedom of art. It is entirely forgotten that children must be protected in a different way from grown persons. The same principle applies to public placards. Many of these are disgusting, and border on the line that would enable a prosecution to be successfully undertaken. To say the least they are extremely vulgar and brutalizing; they are continually feeding the mind of the young with evil suggestions; and they induce a coarse and animal view of life. These pictures remain indelibly photographed on the minds of the young. Why should the young not be protected? Why should city councils not have a discretionary authority to keep the streets, which are public thoroughfares, free from this moral poison?

The following extract is from a letter which I received to-day:—

I beg that you will draw attention to the disgusting posters of the theatres of districts such as New Cross, Deptford and Greenwich, which seem to be getting worse and worse. I fear this also applies to the low class or so-called "secondary" theatres of large towns.

These posters depict murders, death and crime of every description in the most revolting manner, and are unfit for children or women or even men to see. Moreover, the Queen's uniform is generally brought prominently forward. If the plays may be judged from these posters it is a disgrace that such pandering to the lower instincts of the "masses" should be tolerated for one single performance.

I do not think this House realizes what a relief it would be to fathers and mothers if they knew that these debasing advertisements could be suppressed.

I bring these evils before the House assured of the sympathy of the

Home Secretary. I know that he wishes his hands to be strengthened by this House, and I feel sure, that if it gives a strong expression of opinion, an era of reform will set in which will be fruitful of good to the rising generation.

EXTRACT FROM THE "TIMES," JULY 14, 1900.

Mr. SOUTTAR (Dumfriesshire) seconded the motion. He said it was especially on behalf of young men that he pleaded with the Home Secretary. He did not pretend that it was possible to prevent sin in London. All they asked was that the Home Office should make London just as good as other cities were. He did not know any city in India, in America, on the Continent, or in the provinces in this country, which at all approached to the condition of London. In London we saw vice flaunting. Hon. members would perhaps say that in other countries vice was thrust underground. That was perfectly true, but he thought there was very great danger in the open flaunting of vice. He knew temptation must abound, but he thought the Home Secretary, aided by the strong opinion of the House of Commons, could arrange that there should be less of that open temptation which so easily caught young men when they first came to London. He also appealed to the right hon. gentleman on behalf of the daughters of poor and respectable working men, and pointed out that in many parts of London the condition of the streets had reduced the value of property.

Sir M. W. RIDLEY said he did not doubt the earnestness of the hon. gentleman who had moved the reduction of his salary for the very extraordinary reason that he was not able to control the morals of London, nor the earnestness of the hon. gentleman who seconded the motion. He agreed with the hon. member that a great many of the things which were seen in London, advertisements and otherwise, were disgusting. There was a very great difference between objectionable publications and objectionable demonstrations, which came within the law, and those which were merely coarse, vulgar and, if they liked, degrading, but which it was not possible at present to criminally prosecute. It was, in these circumstances, rather hard that the Home Office or the police should be attacked, as the hon. member who seconded the motion had done, for not having done more to keep more private and free from abomination particular streets in London. He should be very glad to know any case in which either the hon. gentleman or the hon. member for Flintshire considered the police had failed to do their duty in the way of prosecutions. He was quite willing to take upon himself the responsibility for the police. Nobody could be altogether pleased with a great many things one saw in certain parts of London at certain times of the night; but he did not agree that, under the present condition of the law or under any condition of the law that was likely to be sanctioned by Parliament, it was very easy to remedy that state of things. To clear the streets of women who solicited, they must have evidence to take before the magistrates; and, although the police walked about mostly in couples in order to avoid mistakes and charges of blackmail, the persons who were subjected to annoyance were not, as a rule, willing to come forward, and without their evidence there was very little chance of obtaining convictions. He had assured the police over and over again that they would receive every support from the Home Office in taking cases before the magistrates in which there was evidence that there had been a contravention of the law to the annoyance of any person in the street. The figures showed that there had been an increase of these charges during the last few years and an increase of convictions. (Hear, hear.) To make the police the primary prosecutors in these cases was a dangerous thing (hear, hear), but he had instructed the police to give every assistance in their power to

persons who brought such charges, and those who brought charges against persons breaking the law would have the entire support of the Home Office. He did not understand the hon. member for Flintshire to make any charge against him for failing to support local authorities in the suppression of disorderly houses. The police were instructed to give every assistance to local authorities, and a great deal had been done in this direction during the last few years. Last year there were 222 convictions in cases brought mainly through the action of the police. The hon. member for Dumfriesshire had referred to the case of those infamous persons who lived upon the earnings of these unhappy women, but he failed to give the Home Office credit for the passing of an Act two years ago which so frightened many persons that, before it received the Royal assent, they fled from the country. In London during the two months of 1898 in which the Act was in operation there were 39 prosecutions and 33 convictions, while last year there were about 200 charges and 130 convictions of such persons. (Hear, hear.) The hon. member for Flintshire had referred to the exhibition of newspapers and photographs which were demoralizing and degrading, and he agreed that much of what was going on in this respect must be shocking to any man or woman who had regard to the morality of the country. But, coarse as many of these publications were, they did not come within the limits of the law as far as he knew, while with regard to the living pictures to which the hon. gentleman had directed his attention there was not one in which there was a chance of obtaining a conviction. He had done everything he could within the limits of the law, both to protect the streets of London, to keep them as clear as possible, and to give every assistance to local authorities to put down disorderly houses. Everything that was possible had been done to prosecute with effect, and he did not think anything had been shown why he should depart from the course he had taken. In fact, he had failed in some cases. He was most anxious to carry out the law as it stood, and he did think that a good deal more could be done if more public feeling were exhibited in deprecation of a good deal of what was done. But there was the question of bringing people within the criminal law. The police were not insensible of their duty in any respect, and as long as he held his office he would do his best under advice to deal with that which could be taken notice of. After this assurance he hoped the Committee would be content with the discussion which had taken place. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. BURNS referred to the great work done by the County Council in the past ten years in clearing objectionable persons out of the parks under the control of the Council, and he thought similar good work might be done in Hyde Park and in some of the streets. He held that the Home Secretary was not doing all that he might do under the law. Why did he say that? He had the honour and pleasure of helping the late Attorney-General one morning in 1898 in getting through a very small Act which seemed to have done a great deal of good. That was the amendment of the Vagrancy Act of 1824.

Sir M. W. RIDLEY.—My own Act.

Mr. BURNS was agreed; he did not want to deny the right hon. gentleman's authorship or the divided authorship between him and the late Attorney-General. Within a week of this Act being passed 400 French, Belgian, German and other foreign bullies and *souteneurs* left London and returned to the continent. Whatever was said about the women on whom these men lived, for the men themselves there could be no sympathy. (Cheers.) And yet during the last two years they had reappeared in London owing to the lax administration of the Act which had first driven them away. He could run the Home Secretary round (laughter) some quarters in the West-end where these degraded criminals were re-establishing themselves, and where a bestial form of vice of Eastern origin was taking root. If the Home Secre-

tary would transfer for two years the police of the East of London to the districts of the A, B, C, D and E divisions, they would, by merely asserting the standards of decency of the East-end, put an end to much of what the hon. member for Flintshire complained. The right hon. gentleman admitted that blackmailing was on the increase. (Sir M. W. Ridley dissented.) Well, that was the fact; and though the Metropolitan force, next to the City police, was the best police force in the world, there were conditions existing which tended to undermine probity and vigilance. It was ridiculous to expect a married policeman to be on duty in the neighbourhood of Piccadilly—with *souteneurs* and brothel-keepers all round him—and do his duty strictly on a wage of 21*s.* 10*d.* a week. (Cheers.) No policeman in the West-end district should have less than 30*s.* a week with a lodging allowance. The increase would only affect about 1,000 men; and the change it would bring about would be very great. The right hon. gentleman might ask, "What reason have you to suggest for an increase of wage?" In the report this year he found that 2,000 constables were reported and punished out of 13,000, that 349 were reduced in pay from 2*s.* to 8*s.* a week, and that 131 were dismissed the force. He wanted to know why those 2,000 constables were reported and punished, and why 131 were dismissed last year. Another complaint he had to make with reference to the police was that the law was evaded with regard to coffee stalls at night time. He referred to those coffee stalls in certain parts of London which had sprung up, where prostitutes congregated, and which had become a rendezvous for disorderly people and thieves. If the police were better treated and better paid they would be able to deal with these questions better than they could now. He held a protest in his hand from the Lambeth, Rotherhithe and Walworth Vestries' Conference on the condition of the London streets at night time, and the Vestries agreed with him in saying that if the police and the Home Secretary did their duty, many of the objectionable things witnessed in the streets could be abolished. The Home Secretary must know that in the journal read by all the men in the force, the best men of the London police force were saying that there was a condition of things going on with regard to the Metropolitan force that made for dereliction of duty, that tempted men to lie under obligations to restaurant keepers, club proprietors and brothel keepers. This was the touting that went on for the sale of tickets for the Police Orphanage and police excursions. What took place? A policeman was told off to go to West-end clubs or to brothels kept under the name of clubs, and to ask the proprietors to buy £5 worth of tickets. The proprietors anxious to be on good terms with the police, bought the tickets, and then said, "Take them back." The result was that the tickets were sold over and over again, and the men made money out of them in this way. The fact therefore was that the West-end club proprietors and the brothel-keepers had the police directly under their control. If the Home Secretary did not stop this proceeding, then the evil would deepen until they saw a state of affairs in London similar to what was seen in the "Tenderloin" district of New York, where the chief inspector had earned £10,000 a year by blackmailing the gambling-hells and the prostitutes. Let the Home Office get rid also of its four chief constables, receiving about £4,000 a year. They were not wanted; they were superfluous, unnecessary and mischievous; and the money thus saved could be used to raise the wages of the constables. Nor should the superintendents of the police go about the town in the plain clothes they wore. They never saw a superintendent of the London division; either he was poring over musty documents or riding about in a dog-cart in civilian clothes. Let the superintendent walk about as he did in other towns, accessible to every one, and bring himself into contact with the people. We had a good police force, but it was being "militarised" too much. He believed that the best police force was a civilian one; but he was sure that the streets of London would never be as pure as they ought to be until the *mini-*

wage of the constables was raised, and they were put beyond the temptations which surrounded them. (Cheers.)

Sir M. STEWART, Mr. H. J. WILSON, Mr. SPICER and Mr. CHANNING having also spoken,

Mr. S. SMITH asked leave to withdraw his motion, at the same time thanking the Home Secretary for his sympathetic reply.

Appendix XVII

THE NEW SCHOOL OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM

A PARABLE AND FORECAST, PUBLISHED MAY, 1901

ABOUT a thousand years after this, a great school of philosophical historians arose in Europe. By that time the British Empire had passed away, and the causes of its "decline and fall" were expounded by future Gibbons. Among the causes of its decline a chief place was given to a war in South Africa, which was assigned to the years 1900 and 1901 A.D. But this historical school, profiting by the discoveries in Old Testament criticism, applied these methods of research to the ancient histories of England. They examined with microscopic care the various discrepancies in the accounts of the Boer War, the linguistic terms used by the annalists of the day, above all the evidence of later authorship and patriotic frauds, and were rewarded with astonishing discoveries which enabled them to recast the legendary history of those early times.

They discovered such astounding contradictions in the contemporary narratives as pointed clearly to a composite work drawn from several sources, and edited at a late date by a redactor who represented the dominant race. Upon unearthing some faded copies of a newspaper called the London *Times*, which were found enclosed in a cavity of the monument to a certain Queen Victoria, thought by some to be identical with Boadicea, it was found that two entirely opposite views of the war were held in the ancient British senate. It was discovered that the speeches of men of Celtic names were for the most part full of praise of the Boers, while those of Anglo-Saxon names were filled with invectives against them. The names of Dillon, of Lloyd George, and Bryn Roberts—all Celts by origin—stood out as champions of the Boers, whereas the names of Chamberlain, Milner, and Rhodes, all Anglo-Saxon, were identified with strong attacks on the Dutch populations of the Boer States. From this it is surmised that reminiscences of the Celtic resistance to Julius Caesar had mingled with much later events.

Pursuing this golden thread further, the future Gibbons of the year 2900 disentangled the skein of errors into which traditional theories of ancient history had led us. It was clearly proved by subjective analysis that long periods of time and many wars were erroneously assigned to the years 1900 and 1901.

Some of the grounds for this conclusion may be indicated briefly.

The despatches of the British Commander-in-Chief claimed a surprising series of victories, and extolled to the skies the valour and constancy of the British Army, especially as shown in the brilliant defence of Ladysmith and Mafeking. But the speeches of John Dillon and others poured contempt on these statements, accused the Brtish Commanders of cruelty and inefficiency, and extolled to the skies the courage and patriotism of the Boers. Further exploration brought to light the opinion of contemporary nations such as the French and Germans, and it was found that the literature of these countries was filled with abuse of Great Britain, accusing her of bringing on the war for the lust of gold, and of conducting it with great cruelty.

It became at last perfectly clear that the records of several wars had become fused into one. The prodigies of valour reported by the British Commander clearly belonged to the period of Cressy and Agincourt, when by all accounts the valour of the English nation was at the highest, and the disparaging contrast with the Boers evidently belonged to a much later period, say about 2400 A.D., when the British Empire was in a state of decay. This is all the more clear when you reflect that some 200,000 troops were unable to capture a Boer chief called De Wet, who had not more than 2,000 men under his command.

It is also proved more plainly by the strangely contradictory accounts given of De Wet. By the Celtic orators and by the French and German historians that have survived, he is represented as the William Tell or the William Wallace of South Africa, and his little band of heroes is likened to the Spartans at Thermopylæ ; whereas the Anglo-Saxon chroniclers describe him as a kind of guerilla chief or brigand, whose principal occupation was wrecking trains and robbing their contents.

It is quite clear that the legendary hero was largely a creation of fancy. He resembled the Joshua of the Old Testament, who by Israelite tradition was supposed to have conquered Canaan, whereas it is now well known by scholars who have examined the tablets of Chaldea and Assyria that his exploits were largely mythical. Indeed, there is a startling analogy between the composition of the Pentateuch, or, as it is now called, the Hexateuch, and the extant histories of the South African war. In the former case scholars have long ago discovered the composite materials that go to form the books ascribed to Moses and Joshua. They have detected Elohist and Jahwist elements which are combined in Genesis, and "the priestly code" in Leviticus and Deuteronomy which is at least 1,000 years later than the primitive Ten Commandments, which perhaps was the sole work of Moses which has survived. Indeed, they have discovered several independent layers of history and legend that overlap one another in the early part of the Old Testament, and which they designate by various titles and even by coloured paragraphs, so that the common people can now easily see for themselves what is true and what is fabulous, and we are now in the year 2900 A.D. applying this marvellous touchstone to the mixture of truth and fable which go to form the ancient history of the South African war. Indeed, some of our most competent critics have gone even further. Gifted with rare insight,

they have discovered that individual names do not represent persons at all, but tribes ; and just as it is well known that the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, are but tribal names representing tribal religions, so it is held that such names as Chamberlain, Krüger, etc., do not represent individuals, but races of mankind. This becomes highly probable when you analyse the speeches attributed to these personages. Krüger is represented as a strange compound of greed, cunning, and religion. He is constantly appealing to the aid of his tribal deity, Jehovah, just as the Homeric heroes appeal to Jupiter or Mars ; whereas Chamberlain, Milner, and Rhodes preserve absolute silence on supernatural interposition. They evidently belong to a much later period, which we may designate the age of reason ; Krüger belongs to the primitive age of superstition when men believed that celestial beings took an interest in human affairs. In fact, Krüger, in the opinion of some first-class German scholars, must have lived near the Homeric times, or at least in the early days of Christianity, while those other personages belong to an age when primitive religions had died out. Indeed, some of our acutest critics have discovered under different names an identity of character between a mythical hero called Oliver Cromwell and Paul Krüger. Both are represented as constantly appealing to the Almighty, and yet both are described as arrogant and ambitious and greedy of supreme power. It is coming to be suspected by our ablest scholars that these two personalities are but one ; the Anglo-Saxon name Cromwell being the equivalent of the Low Dutch Krüger, just as the Greek Zeus is the equivalent of the Latin Jupiter. There are some slight difficulties connected with the different legends which have grown up around them, but these are not greater than have been successfully surmounted in the legends of Moses and Joshua. Who can believe for a moment that the story of the Exodus is true history or that the wilderness journey, or the apparition on Mount Sinai of the Most High, are anything but myths and allegories ? So in like manner the incredible story of Cromwell and his Ironsides, and the execution of his king are obviously inventions of a later age, just as are the exploits of Krüger, who is represented as a kind of blend between Hercules and Gideon !

The great principle which underlies our higher criticism is that ancient history is poetry rather than prose. It is the outcome of folk-lore and superstition ; and though it has a kernel of truth, it is in the main the product of a later period when the historic imagination was applied to primitive legends. In this way the siege of Troy, the taking of Jericho, the siege of Londonderry and that of Ladysmith, are literary creations of a later date, Achilles and Hector typifying the conflict of Greek and Asiatic ideas ; Joshua and the king of Jericho represent the monotheistic and polytheistic types of Semitism, while Londonderry and Ladysmith of a later time represent, the one an age-long contest between traditional religion and liberty of thought, and the other, the struggle between progress and inertia. No trace has been found of a material siege of Ladysmith, no remains of ramparts or bastions, and our scholars have proved to demonstration that it ranks with such

epics as King Arthur and his Round Table, or the mythical story of David and Goliath.

The great advantage of the higher criticism is that it has dispelled all traces of superstition except among the most ignorant of our people. A "great western tradition" for many centuries ascribed to Jesus of Nazareth supernatural powers. By some He was believed to be the Most High God. His alleged sayings and those of His Apostles were collected in a book called the New Testament, and were imposed by a priestly caste on the ignorant population of Europe and America. To our scholars and critics we owe deliverance from this bondage. They have clearly shown by subjective analysis the mythical character of the chief actor in the drama. He was, so far as history can be trusted, a victim of unconscious illusion, if not an accomplice in pious frauds.

The old philosopher Archimedes said that if he had a lever of sufficient length and a corresponding fulcrum he could move the world. Old Testament criticism has given us this lever. It has proved to demonstration that the great Teacher believed in all the Jewish fables of the age. He is reported to have said, "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have eternal life." Again he said, "Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed Me." Again, "As Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." Again, "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day; and he saw it, and was glad." It was not difficult to show that no reliance could be put on a teacher who was so destitute of the critical faculty, and it is no wonder that his prophecies have fallen into disfavour. It is true that he is said to have predicted the destruction of Jerusalem, just as Isaiah is said to have predicted the fall of Babylon. But all critics believe that these so-called "prophecies" were made after the event, and antedated to support the tradition of supernatural knowledge. It is clear to men of understanding that one who believed such fables as the brazen serpent story, the flood of Noah, the tale of Jonah, and the personality of Abraham, cannot be trusted when he speaks of a future life, of resurrection and of judgment to come. The truth is the theological age is past, the age of philosophy and free thought has come. The scholar has dispossessed the priest. The honour and emoluments too long enjoyed by ghostly fathers have passed to men of brains and culture.

The means by which this victory was achieved may now be made public. It was long felt by men of "light and leading" that so long as veneration was paid to an old book called the Bible, and so long as it was taught in our schools and colleges by those who believed it, no impression could be made on the dense mass of superstition. But stratagem accomplished what open assault could not do. The chairs of philosophy and theology were filled by professors who turned their guns upon the citadel itself. The reign of free thought began among the defenders of the faith, and when the enemy made their next assault they found the gates of the citadel open and its walls crumbling to the

ground. A further help was given by a section of the "religious press," which always applauded the latest and most advanced criticism, and by a "mutual admiration society" of authors, which wrote encomiums on each other's books as soon as they appeared. Their motto was "Odi profanum vulgus et arceo." They extolled the books which flouted the convictions of the common people, and raised pæans of victory as each position of traditional faith was stormed and captured.

And so the emancipating work of scholarship is well-nigh accomplished: Faith is now labelled credulity, and the men of understanding are few who believe in the legends either of sacred or profane history. The world is governed by reason, and our statues are raised to emancipators like Hume and Voltaire, Strauss and Renan.

The doctrine of Epicurus rules the word: "Pleasure is the chief good." The very language has changed. Meaningless words like "patriotism," "benevolence," "self-sacrifice," have disappeared from use; so have archaic terms like "sin" and "salvation," "heaven" and "hell." We no longer waste our resources on building churches and hospitals, asylums and poorhouses. Reason is our deity, and it tells us that the "lethal chamber" is the easiest way of disposing of the sick and dying. Mothers no longer rear infirm infants to trouble the community. Every man does that which is right in his own eyes. Our motto is, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." The Ten Commandments are obsolete, especially the Seventh, which is abolished by statute, and the sacred right of suicide is granted to all. It is true that some old fools still believe the words of St. Peter that "the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night," and that "the Earth and the works that are therein shall be burned up"; and sometimes we have a bad quarter of an hour when a thunderstorm darkens the sky; but we take comfort from the words spoken to our first parents by that great Iconoclast who restored to us the forbidden fruit: "God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened and ye shall be as gods knowing good and evil"!!!

Explanatory Note

It seems superfluous to say to educated readers of the *Excursus* that the vein of irony adopted is on the lines of Pascal's *Provençal Letters*, or Archbishop Whately's *Doubts of the Existence of Napoleon Buonaparte*; but intimations have reached the writer that some readers who lack the sense of humour have missed the point, and are shocked at its impiety. For such I may say it was intended that they should be shocked at the awful consequences that flow from the rejection of the solemn testimony of Holy Scripture as set forth (for example) in 2 Peter chap. iii. verses 3–7 and 11–13:—

Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts.

And saying, Where is the promise of His coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the Creation.

For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by the Word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water, and in the water:

Whereby the world than then was, being overflowed with water, perished:

But the heavens and the earth, which are now by the same Word, are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men.

Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness.

Looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat?

Nevertheless we, according to His promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.

Appendix XVIII

Lord Rosebery's *Speech on* Mr. Gladstone

The Earl of Rosebery: My Lords, there would at first sight appear little left to be said after what has been so eloquently and feelingly put from both sides of the House; but as Mr. Gladstone's last successor in office, and as one who was associated with him in many of the most critical episodes of the last twenty years of his life, your Lordships will perhaps bear with me for a moment while I say what little I can say on such a subject and on such an occasion. My Lords, it has been said by the Prime Minister, and I think truly, that the time has not yet come to fix with any approach to accuracy the place that Mr. Gladstone will fill in history. We are too near him to do more than note the vast space that he filled in the world, the great influence that he exercised, his constant contact with all the great movements of his time. But the sense of proportion must necessarily be absent, and it must be left for a later time, and even, perhaps, for a later generation, accurately to appraise and appreciate the relation. My Lords, the same may also be said of his intellect and of his character. They are, at any rate, too vast a subject to be treated on such an occasion as this. But I may at least cite the words, which I shall never forget, which were used by the noble Marquess when Mr. Gladstone resigned the office of Prime Minister, that—

"His was the most brilliant intellect that had been applied to the service of the State since Parliamentary government began."

That seems to me an adequate and a noble appreciation; but there is also this pitiful side, incident to all mortality, but which strikes one more strongly with regard to Mr. Gladstone than with regard to any one else, and it is this—that intellect, mighty by nature, was fashioned and prepared by the labour of every day and almost every hour until the last day of health—fashioned to be so perfect a machine, only to be stopped for ever by a single touch of the Angel of Death. My Lords, there are two features of Mr. Gladstone's intellect which I cannot help noting on this occasion, for they were so signal and so salient, and distinguished him so much, so far as I know, from all other minds that I have come into contact with, that it would be wanting to this occasion if they were not noted. The first was his enormous power of concentration. There never was a man, I believe, in this world who, at any given moment, on any given subject, could so devote every resource

and power of his intellect, without the restriction of a single nerve within him, to the immediate purpose of that subject and that object. And the second feature is one which is also rare, but which, I think, has never been united so much with the faculty of concentration, and it is this: the infinite variety and multiplicity of his intellect. There was no man, I suspect, in the history of England—no man, at any rate, in recent centuries—who touched the intellectual life of the country at so many points, and over so great a range of years. But that, in reality, was not merely a part of his intellect, but of his character, for the first and most obvious feature of Mr. Gladstone's character was the universality and the humanity of his sympathy. I do not now mean, as we all know, that he sympathized with great causes and with oppressed nations, and with what he believed to be the cause of liberty all over the world; but I do mean his sympathy with all classes of human beings, from the highest to the lowest. That, I believe, was one of the secrets of his almost unparalleled power over his fellow men. May I give two instances of what I mean? The first time he visited Midlothian we were driving away from, I think, his first meeting, and we were followed by a shouting crowd as long as their strength would permit; but there was one man who held on much longer than any of them, who ran, I should think, for two miles, with evidently some word he was anxious to say, and when he dropped away we listened for what it might be. It was this: "I wished to thank you, Sir, for the speech you made to the workhouse people." I dare say not many of your Lordships recollect that speech; for my purpose, it does not particularly matter what its terms may have been. We should think it, however, an almost overwhelming task to speak to a workhouse audience, and to administer words of consolation and sympathy to a mass who, after all, represent in the main exhaustion, and failure and destitution. That was the lowest class. Let me take another instance—from the highest. I believe that the last note Mr. Gladstone wrote with his own hand was written to Lady Salisbury, to ask her about a carriage accident in which the noble Marquess had been involved. I think it is pathetic, and characteristic of the man, that in the hour of his sore distress, when he could hardly put pen to paper, he should have written that note of sympathy to the wife of the most prominent, and not the least generous, of his political opponents. My Lords, sympathy was one great feature of Mr. Gladstone's character. There was another with which the noble Marquess has dealt, which I will only touch on in a single word, for it is a subject not for this moment or for this purpose. I mean the depth of his Christian faith. I have heard, not often, and have seen it made a subject for cavil, for sarcasm, for scoffing remarks. Those remarks were the offspring of ignorance, and not of knowledge. The faith of Mr. Gladstone, obviously to all who knew him, pervaded every act and every part of his life. It was the faith, the pure faith, of a child, confirmed by the experience and the conviction of a man. And that last word brings me to the other, and the only other point of his character, on which I would say a word. There was no expression so frequently on Mr. Gladstone's lips as the word "manhood." Speak-

INDEX

Index

Abbot, Dr. Lyman, 364
Acland, Mr., 285
America, first visit to, 21–29; Civil War, 34; visit in 1866, 76–85; third visit to, 361–376; fourth visit to, 428, 430–436.
Armenian questions and people, 269, 339, 347, 349
Asquith, the Right. Hon. H. H., 310, 333

Baines, Sir Edward, 268
Balfour, Alexander, 89–90, 91, 109, 127, 130, 135, 232, 385
Balfour, the Right Hon. Arthur, as Chief Secretary for Ireland, 239; on the bimetallic question, 283; and Women's Suffrage, 296–297; and Disestablishment, 380; at Mr. Gladstone's funeral, 401, 408; 422; 460
Balfour, Professor, 10
Bannerman, Sir Henry Campbell, 334
Barbour, Mr. W. B., 15, 292
Barnardo, Dr., 161–163, 427
Bartlett, Sir Ellis Ashmead, 421
Beaconsfield, Lord, 120
Beet, Professor Agar, 98–101
Biblical criticism, the new school of, 612–617
Blackie, John Stuart, 10
Boer War, 53, 243, 425
Booth, General, 289–290, 311
Bradlaugh, Charles, 142–143
Bright, John, 229, 267
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James, 22
Bunting, Mr. Percy, 173
Burns, John, M.P., 144

Cadbury, Mr. George, 33
Caine, Mr. W. S., M.P., 15, 126, 142, 285, 335
Carnegie, Mr. Andrew, 12
Cavendish, Lord Frederick, 133
Chalmers, Thomas, 9
Chamberlain, the Rt. Hon. Joseph, and Local Option, 127; and the Merchant Shipping Bill, 153; and Home Rule, 229; and Free Education, 291; in Lord Salisbury's administration, 334; and the Workmen's Compensation Act, 381
Charrington, Mr. F. N., 426
Clark, Dr. and Mrs., and the C. E. Convention, 382
Cleveland, President, 340
Coronation of King Edward, 384
Cotton, Sir Arthur, 46
Courtney, the Rt. Hon. Leonard, 117
Crete, 381
Cross, Lord, 172
Currie, Sir Donald, 15
Curzon, Lord, 47, 348, 447–449

Derby, Lord, 347
Devonshire, the Duke of, 334
Dickson, Mr. Thomas, M.P., 270–271
Disruption, 2, 3, 4

Drummond, Professor Henry, 254–255, 312

Education in America, 25; Act of 1870, 91–92; in Germany, 246–248; the Bill of 1896, 353; the education question, 354–356; Bill of 1897, 381
Ellis, Mr. Thomas, 423–424
Evidence, publication of scandalous and indecent, 552–556

Fairbairn, Dr., 304
Forster, W. E., 92, 141, 145, 259
Fowler, Sir Henry, 117, 309, 310
Free Trade *versus* Reciprocity, 577–592
Frere, Sir Bartle, 52–53

Garfield, President, 29
Garrett, the Rev. Charles, 94
George, Henry, 148–151
Germany, the Emperor of, 293, 340
Gladstone, Mr. W. E., 9, 24, 39; *The Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture*, 41; 101; and Turkish atrocities, 119–120, 122; in power, 130; and the Irish question, 132–134, 139; as a Parliamentary leader, 146, 152; at Edinburgh, 164; change of policy towards Ireland, 229; the first Home Rule Bill, 229–233; Home Rule, 281–282; and the Parnell crisis, 288; and Women's Suffrage, 297, 566–569; and the Home Rule Bill, 306–307; retirement, 309; and Church questions, 320; Irish policy, 334; and Armenians, 339–340; and the Convention of 1881, 347; at Cannes, 385; death, 408–411
Gold Standard, the sufferings caused by the appreciation of the, an address, 488–500.
Gore, Bishop, 101
Gorst, Sir John, 262, 463
Goschen, Mr., 283, 285, 291
Grey, Sir Edward, 348
Guinness, Dr. Grattan, 125, 427
Gully, the Rt. Hon. W. C., 333

Halifax, Lord, 321
Hall, Charlton, 20
Harcourt, Sir William, 152, 270, 283, 309, 334, 400, 408, 422
Howell, Mr. George, M.P., 245
Hughes, the Rev. Hugh Price, 427

India, first visit to, 45–61, 175–194
Irish question, difficulties of the, 557–565

Jameson Raid, the, 345–347

Kennaway, Sir John, 348
King Edward VII., 470
Krüger, Mr., 344–345, 425

Lawson, Sir Wilfred, 126, 143, 335
Lincoln, President, 22, 29, 34, 44
Liverpool, literary societies, 15; Philomathic Society, 16; the Temperance Movement in, 106–110, 126–128; political situation in, 129–130; University College, 131
Lockhart, William P., 37, 135, 301, 308, 573–576
London streets, the evils of, 600–611
Low, Seth, 29
Lundie, Dr., 109, 121, 124, 127, 294

Manchester Ship Canal, 156–157
Manchester *Guardian*, 116
McKinley, President, 29, 341, 362, 433
Milner, Lord, 425
Mitchell, Dr. J. Murray, 60, 299
Moncrieff, Sir Colin Scott, 47, 61, 177
Moody, Mr., 92–94
Morley, Mr. John, 144, 195

Müller, George, 40, 41, 486
Mundella, Mr., 143, 159–161

Nationalization of land, the, 501–522
Naval supremacy (British) and merchant cruisers, 593–599
Newman, John Henry, 410

Oxford Movement, the secret history of the, 390–391

Palmer, Dr., 363
Palmerston, Lord, 44
Patterson, John, 114, 116, 135
Pauper Children, the administration of "Barrack Schools" for, 523–528
Pease, Sir Joseph, 266
Peel, Lord, 153

Ramsay, Lord, 130
Rathbone, Mr. Samuel, 91
Rathbone, Mr. William, M.P., 130, 131, 141
Rendall, Dr., 131
Rhodes, Mr. Cecil, 345
Ritualism, the movement against, 338–339
Roberts, Mr. John, M.P., 128
Romeward Movement, the, 357–360
Rosebery, Lord, at Mr. Gladstone's Edinburgh meeting, 164; banquet at Liverpool, 169; Prime Minister, 309; Government, 310; resigns, 334; and Armenian affairs, 340; at Mr. Gladstone's funeral, 408; speech on Mr. Gladstone, 618–621

Salisbury, Lord, 120, 172, 267, 286, 299, 317, 320, 334, 408
Sankey, Mr., 92–94
Scotland, religious teaching in, 6, 7
Simpson, William, 106–107
Smith, Melville, *letter*, 570–572
Smith, Samuel—
Chapter I.—Birth, 1; grandfather, 2; aunts, 4; early life and education, 4–6; school life, 8; favourite reading, 8–9; at Edinburgh University, 10; excursions to the Highlands, 10–11
Chapter II.—Visit to Liverpool, 14; apprenticed, 14; studies, 14–15; early friendships, 15; influenced by Liverpool literary societies, 15; experiences in the cotton trade, 16–18; contributes to the Liverpool *Daily Post*, 18; holidays in Wales, 19–20
Chapter III.—Visits America, 21–29; first interest in the Irish question, 24; homeward voyage, 30–31; in Ireland, 30
Chapter IV.—Tour in Lancashire, 32; starts in business, 33; business during American Civil War, 34–35
Chapter V.—Religious experience, 37, 38; Christian work, 39, 40; associations with the Plymouth Brethren, and Quakers, 42, 43
Chapter VI.—Visit to India, 45; 61; *letter*, 48–49; *letters*, 53–55, 55–58, 58–59; partner in the firm of Finlay, Muir & Co., 61; Suez, 61; visit to Palestine, 61–70; *letters*, 62–67, 67–70; at Constantinople, 70; *letters*, 70–73; on the Danube, 72–73; home, 73
Chapter VII.—Business in Liverpool, 74; marriage, 75; wedding trip, 75; life at Liscard Vale, 76; birth and death of first-born son, 76; visit to America, 76–85; holiday trips to Switzerland, 85–86

Smith, Samuel, *continued*—
Chapter VIII. — Summer at Windermere, 87 ; birth of James Gordon Smith, 88 ; religious and philanthropic work in Liverpool, 89–94 ; member of the Council of Education, 91 ; association with Moody and Sankey, 92–94
Chapter IX.—Religious controversy, 91 ; *Life in Christ*, 96–97 ; *letter* to the Rev. Edward White, 97–98 ; *letter* to Professor Agar Beet, 99–101 ; *The Credibility of the Christian Religion*, 103
Chapter X.—Home at "Carleton," Sefton Park, 105 ; the "Clerical Club," 105 ; work at the Coliseum, 106–110
Chapter XI.—Death of his father and sister, 111 ; President of the Chamber of Commerce, 111 ; interest in the Silver question, 111–118
Chapter XII.—Studies of the land laws of the Continent, 121 ; three Continental trips, 121 ; visit to the Waldensian valleys, 123
Chapter XIII.—Member of the Town Council, 128 ; Scottish holidays, 131
Chapter XIV.—Invited to contest the Liverpool Division, 135 ; decision, 136 ; election campaign, 136–138 ; addresses, 136–137 ; becomes M.P. for Liverpool, 138
Chapter XV.—Introduction to Parliament, 141 ; first speech, 142 ; interest in education, 143–144 ; literary work, 144 ; effects of Parliamentary life, 145–147
Chapter XVI.—Experiences in the Henry George agitation, 148–151
Smith, Samuel, *continued*—
Chapter XVII.—Parliamentary experience, 152–157
Chapter XVIII. — Work for children, 158–163
Chapter XIX.—At Mr. Gladstone's meeting, 164 ; visit to Rome, 166–168 ; return, 168
Chapter XX.—Home at Delahay Street, 170 ; work for the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 172–173 ; "Craigieburn," 173
Chapter XXI.—Loses seat in Parliament, 175 ; second visit to India, 175–194 ; Italy, 176–177 ; *letters*, 179–194
Chapter XXII.—Elected for Flintshire, 195 ; last days in India, 196 ; "Indian Problems," 197–225
Chapter XXIII.—Home from India, 229–230 ; death of his friend, Andrew Balfour, 232 ; in Flintshire, 232–233 ; holiday in the Highlands, 233–234
Chapter XXIV.—At Hawarden, 235–236 ; work in Liverpool, 236–237 ; visit to Cannes, 237–238
Chapter XXV.—Whitsuntide in Wales, 241–242
Chapter XXVI.—At the Jubilee festivities, 244 ; in Switzerland and Germany, 245–248 ; winter work, 248
Chapter XXVII.—Parliamentary work, 1888, 249–254 ; at Henry Drummond's meetings at Grosvenor House, 254–255 ; in Scotland, 255 ; and the Ashbourne Act, 255–256
Chapter XXVIII.—At Cannes, 257 ; and the debate on Evening Continuation Schools, 257–258 ; on payment of members, 259–261 ; on drink

Smith, Samuel, *continued*—
and opium in India, 262–266 ; and Armenian people, 269
Chapter XXIX.—In Perthshire, 270 ; visits Ireland, 271 ; Irish impressions, 271–281
Chapter XXX.—At Lausanne, 283 ; Parliamentary work, 283–285
Chapter XXXI.—Scottish holidays, 287 ; in Liverpool, 287 ; and General Booth, 289 ; visits Cannes, 290
Chapter XXXII.—In the Session of 1891, 291 ; at the Liverpool Licensing Sessions, 293
Chapter XXXIII.—Visits Italy, 294–295 ; and Welsh Disestablishment, 295–296 ; and Women's Suffrage, 296–297 ; domestic anxiety, 298–299 ; death of Mrs. Smith, 300–304
Chapter XXXIV.—And "May Meetings," 305 ; loses his friend, W. P. Lockhart, 308 ; at Cannes, 309
Chapter XXXV.—Parliamentary work, 310 ; first visits Keswick Convention, 311 ; challenges the methods of Drummond's *Ascent of Man*, 312–317
Chapter XXXVI.—On Church questions and Disestablishment, 319–329 ; meetings in Liverpool and Flintshire, 330
Chapter XXXVII.—Visits Pau, 332 ; death of his mother, 332 ; and Free Trade, 335–337 ; election contest, 337
Chapter XXXVIII.—And the new Parliament, 338 ; work with the Thoumaians, 339 ; writes to the *Times* on the Venezuelan crisis, 341–344 ; and South African affairs, 344–347
Chapter XXXIX.—Speaks on the Armenian massacres, 349–353 ; education views, 356 ; interest in the Romeward movement, 357–360
Chapter XL.—In America once more, 361–376
Chapter XLI.—And Disestablishment in England and Wales, 377–380 ; on the Diamond Jubilee, 382–384
Chapter XLII.—And Indian affairs, 386–388 ; death of his brother, 388 ; on Church questions, 388–408 ; and Mr. Gladstone's death, 408–411 ; Protestant controversy, 412–413
Chapter XLIII.—Death of his son, 414–420
Chapter XLIV.—On lawlessness in the Church of England, 421–422 ; speaks on the death of Mr. Thomas Ellis, 423–424 ; and the South African War, 425–426 ; and London Philanthropic work, 426–427 ; at Cardiff, 428 ; death of his sister, 428 ; *letter* to the *Liverpool Post* on South Africa, 429–430 ; in America, 428, 430–436
Chapter XLV.—Parliamentary work, 437 ; on the Church question, 438–440 ; speaks on the Indian famine, 440–445 ; on Indian matters, 445–449 ; on plays and their supervision, 449–460 ; and clericalism in Voluntary Schools, 460–463 ; on the condition of London streets, 464–466 ; *letter* to the *Times* on "National Defence," 466–469 ; last words on "National Religion," 470–476 ; Parliament ; contrasts, 477
Smith, J. Gordon, 356, 414–420
Smith, The Rev. Samuel, 2, 483 ; the Misses Smith of Katrine

Bank, 2; James, 15, 46, 76, 131, 135, 195
Smith, Mr. W. H., 239, 283, 291, 293
Socialism, exposure of the fallacies of, 541–551
Speeches (miscellaneous) at Hengler's Circus, Dec. 5, 1882, 529–536; on seconding the address, 537–540
Spence, James, 16
Stanley, H. M., 348
Stead, Mr. W. T., 172
Stowe, Mrs. Harriet Beecher, 27

Temple, Archbishop, 38
Temple, Sir Richard, 262
Thoumaian, Madame, 339

Undergraduates, lives of Scotch, 12

Victoria, Queen, 44; Jubilee, 1887, 243–244; Diamond Jubilee, 383–384
Voluntary Schools, clericalism in, 461–463

Wade, Sir Thomas, 265, 292
White, the Rev. Edward, 96–98, 102, 304
Whitley, Mr. Edward, M.P., 130
Wilberforce, Bishop, 326
Williams, Mr. Carvell, 380
Williamson, Stephen, 114, 116, 141, 166

Butler and Tanner, The Selwood Printing Works, Frome, and London



Stanford University Libraries
3 6105 022 826 106

CECIL H. GREEN LIBRARY
STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305-6004
(650) 723-1493
grncirc@sulmail.stanford.edu
All books are subject to recall.

DATE DUE